

THE
Lutheran
Quarterly



Volume V

MAY, 1953

Number 2

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume V

MAY, 1953

Number 2

CONTENTS

A SUMMER PSALM	John Helmer Olson	115
THE COMMON HYMNAL (Concluded)	E. E. Ryden	116
THE CHURCH OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO LUTHER ..	Uuras Saarnivaara	134
LUTHER AND GREGORY OF RIMINI	Robert Spieler	155
GRUNDTVIG RESEARCH	Johannes Knudsen	167
SCIENTIFIC SECULARISM AND THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION,	Bryce Shoemaker	175
NOTES AND STUDIES:		
The Text of the Printed Lessons in the New Service Book A Committee Report		192
BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES		
Knox, <i>Criticism and Faith</i> (E. E. Flack)		210
Moldenke & Moldenke, <i>Plants of the Bible</i> (H. L. Creager)		211
<i>The Interpreter's Bible</i> , Vol. I (C. M. Cooper)		212
<i>The Bible for Boys and Girls</i>		214
Allis, <i>God Spoke by Moses</i> (H. C. Leupold)		214
Repo, <i>Der Begriff "Rhema" im Biblisch-Griechischen</i> (C. M. Cooper)		214
Hunt, <i>Primitive Gospel Sources</i> (J. W. Heikkinen)		215
Stoeckhardt, <i>Commentary on Ephesians</i> (J. Hall)		216
Grant, <i>The Gospel of Mark</i> (E. E. Flack)		218
Dowey, <i>The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology</i> (U. Saarnivaara)		218
Hershberger, <i>The Mennonite Church in the Second World War</i>		220
Ronnegard, <i>Prairie Shepherd</i> , Lars Paul Esbjörn (A. R. Wentz)		220
Piepkorn, <i>What the Symbolical Books have to Say about Worship</i>		221
<i>Die Bekenntnisschriften der lutherischen Kirche</i> (T. G. Tappert)		221
Baillie & Marsh, eds., <i>Intercommunion</i> (J. J. Pelikan)		222
Van de Pol, <i>The Christian Dilemma</i> (T. G. Tappert)		223
Mattson, <i>Christian Social Consciousness</i> (O. W. Heick)		224
Borgenstierna, <i>Arbetar-teologi altar-teologi</i> (C. Bergendoff)		225
Hough, <i>Great Humanists</i> (M. W. Boyer)		225
Oglesby, <i>You and the Holy Spirit</i> (G. Aus)		226
Stace, <i>Time and Eternity</i> (P. L. Holmer)		226
Kimpel, <i>Religious Faith, Language, and Knowledge</i> (G. W. Forell)		229
Siwek, <i>The Enigma of the Hereafter</i> (O. W. Heick)		230
Bookstaber, <i>The Soul in Medieval Jewish Philosophy</i> (P. L. Holmer)		230
Bailey, <i>Sponsors at Baptism and Confirmation</i>		231
CONTRIBUTORS		232

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Office of Publication, Seminary Hill, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, Books for review to the Book Review Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription \$2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois

Managing Editor

THEODORE S. LIEFELD

Capital University Seminary, Columbus, Ohio

Book Editor

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

7333 Germantown Road, Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Circulation Manager

PAUL M. LINDBERG

Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.

AUGSBURG SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEB.

CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA
WATERLOO, ONT.

GRANDVIEW SEMINARY
DES MOINES, IOWA

HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

LUTHERAN SEMINARY
SASKATOON, SASK.

NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
COLUMBIA, S. C.

SUOMI SEMINARY
HANCOCK, MICH.

TRINITY SEMINARY
BLAIR, NEB.

AIMS AND POLICY

- I. *Aims:* The aims of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.
- II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

A Summer Psalm

When in the stillness of a summer night
I meditate, communing with my God,
The Omnipresent One, whose is the might,
Dominion, power and glory evermore—
My soul by awe is silenced, overwhelmed;
My thoughts, like water dropped into the fire,
Evaporate and vanish in thin air;
I stand before Him crushed to nothingness!
Then gently, as upon the shores of Galilee,
The Christ approaches, speaks to me and smiles,
And lo! My awe is melted into prayer and praise;
My thoughts revive; my soul can breathe again;
The mighty God no longer seems to me
A glowing orb whose brightness burns and blinds.
Instead: behold a Father, in Whose face
I read the chronicle of endless love.

JOHN HELMER OLSON

The Common Hymnal (Concluded)

E. E. RYDEN

IV. AMERICAN HYMNODY

ENGLISH hymns born on American soil are far less numerous than hymns that have come to us from England. There is nothing strange about this, for we must remember that ours is comparatively a young nation. Moreover, early Americans were too pre-occupied in conquering the wilderness to give much thought to sacred poetry. One may seek almost in vain to find a single Christian hymn worthy of the name produced on this side of the Atlantic during the first two centuries of American history. But the struggle for existence in the New World was not the only reason for this dearth of creative effort in the realm of hymnody. America, unfortunately, fell heir to the same iconoclastic influences that prevailed so long in the worship life of England. Just as Calvinism (later exemplified in Puritanism) conspired to stifle all spontaneous spiritual expression in song among the British people from the time of Archbishop Cranmer to the days of Isaac Watts, so the stern Pilgrim Fathers who first came to New England's rocky shores continued to frown on all lyric worship except that derived from the Psalter. (Could it be that the devastating rise of Unitarianism in New England came not merely as a protest and reaction against the uncompromising legalistic theology of Puritanism but even more as a logical fruit of century-long use of worship forms in which the evangelical note of the New Testament was sadly lacking?)

The Plymouth Pilgrims brought with them *The Booke of Psalms: Englished both in Prose and Metre*, published in Amsterdam in 1612 by Henry Ainsworth, an English Separatist clergyman who, like themselves, had been exiled from his native land. It was probably more than a bit of fanciful imagination that caused

Longfellow to record that, when John Alden came on his courtship mission to Priscilla, he found that "open wide on her lap lay the well-worn psalmbook of Ainsworth." The later Puritans, on the other hand, who came directly from England, brought with them the psalmbook of Sternhold and Hopkins, which was then in general use in that country. Dissatisfaction with the latter, however, had become widespread, even in England. Samuel Wesley, father of John, referred to its paraphrases as "scandalous doggerel." When a like spirit of discontent began to manifest itself in New England, the Pilgrim Fathers determined to produce a book of worship of their own. The result was the famous *Bay Psalm Book* which appeared in 1640. The event was a memorable one in that this volume was the first book of any kind to be printed on this side of the Atlantic. Unfortunately, however, it also marked the perpetuation of the iron rule of psalmody in the New World for at least another century.

The *Bay Psalm Book* did little to raise the standards of worship. Despite the fact that the New England theologians who collaborated in producing it were learned men, it must be said in all candor that they were not poets. How an intelligent community could stomach such an inferior literary product merely proved how deeply prejudiced these Puritans were against any lyrical effort that did not slavishly seek to reproduce the exact language of Scripture. Without the help of musical instruments, the singing, too, must have been anything but edifying. Indeed, if we are to judge by the sad notations found in the diaries of some Puritan preachers, it often must have been exceedingly wretched. There probably was ample provocation for the "lines written out of temper on a Pannel in one of the pews in Salem church," and afterwards printed in the *American Apollo*, April 20, 1792:

"Could poor King David but for once
To Salem Church repair,
And hear his Psalms thus warbled out,
Good Lord, how he would swear!"

As in England, so in America, it was the appearance of Isaac

Watts' historic *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* in 1707 that paved the way for the introduction of hymnody in the worship. However, almost half a century passed before Watts' hymns received the recognition they deserved on this side of the Atlantic.

Perhaps it was the coming of George Whitefield to America in 1739 during "The Great Awakening" that was to prove decisive. Whitefield brought with him from England not only the hymns of Watts but also some of the earlier translations and hymns of the Wesleys. The hymns of Watts proved particularly popular, and were sung with great enthusiasm throughout the colonies wherever Whitefield preached. In this promotion of hymn-singing, oddly enough, Whitefield had the support of Jonathan Edwards, whose preaching at Northampton, Mass., had started the revival five years earlier. Calvinist though he was, Edwards himself had discovered the great value of singing in worship, and offered no objection to the use of these "man-made hymns" that seemed to inspire new spiritual fervor wherever they were introduced.

Among the Presbyterians in Virginia, it was a brilliant young clergyman by the name of Samuel Davies who was chiefly responsible for the introduction of the hymns of Watts. Davies, who in 1753 at the age of 30 years succeeded Jonathan Edwards as president of the College of New Jersey, was not content with promoting Watts, however, but went a step farther and began to write hymns himself! When he died at the age of 37, no less than sixteen of his lyrics were printed in a hymnbook published in England. Seven were included in Rippon's *Selection* 1787 and subsequently were noted in Julian's monumental *Dictionary*. Two of these, "Great God of wonders, all Thy ways" and "Lord, I am Thine, entirely Thine," have been widely used, the former in Britain, where it was included in the Scottish Church *Hymnary* as late as 1898, the latter in America. Although both have now disappeared from nearly all hymnals on both sides of the Atlantic, Davies will be remembered as the first native American whose hymns found general recognition.

Among the Lutherans and Moravians, of course, there were

not such inhibitions on hymn-singing. The Swedish and German colonists who settled Delaware and Pennsylvania brought with them their hymnbooks, and also, as soon as they could obtain them, introduced organs and other musical instruments in their worship. The earliest historical record of the use of an organ in any church of the colonies was in connection with the ordination of Justus Falckner as a Lutheran pastor in Gloria Dei Church, Philadelphia, on November 24, 1703, at which time there was also orchestral accompaniment with viols, hautboys, trumpets and kettle drums!

That the Lutherans and Moravians exerted so little influence on the worship life of their English-speaking neighbors may be explained by two facts: 1) they used another language and were looked upon as a "foreign" Church; 2) their neighbors were mostly Quakers or followers of the Calvinist tradition, and therefore were strongly prejudiced against the use of either hymns or musical instruments. Here, however, it should probably be recorded that out of the Lutheran Church of colonial days has come what may be regarded in one sense as the earliest American hymn. It is Justus Falckner's "Rise, ye children of salvation." Although it was written in Germany before Falckner came to this country in 1700, and was included by August Hermann Francke with several other Falckner hymns in Francke's *Geistreiches Gesang Buch* of Halle, it seems to have found a permanent place in American hymnody in its translated form, and therefore we mention it as the first American hymn in our Common Hymnal.

It was almost a hundred years later that another hymn was produced that was destined to live. We refer to Timothy Dwight's "I love thy kingdom, Lord," one of the finest ever written on the theme of the Church. Dwight, a grandson of Jonathan Edwards, was commissioned in 1797 by the Congregationalists and Presbyterians to make a revision of Isaac Watts' *Psalms and Hymns*. This was intended to replace an earlier edition prepared by Joel Barlow which had fallen into disrepute. Dr. Dwight, though he enjoyed high prestige as an illustrious president of Yale College, proceeded cautiously with his assignment. Besides rewriting a number of the psalm paraphrases, he produced some of his own.

Still more important, he also added an appendix of 263 hymns, of which 95 were by writers other than Watts, one being by Charles Wesley. It was evident that both King David and Watts were beginning to lose their exclusive hold on Calvinistic worship! It is significant, however, that Dwight's emphasis was still on the Psalms, and that the hymns were merely annexed.

How very difficult it was for the Calvinistic communions to overcome the deep-seated prejudice against hymns of "human composure" may be judged by the fact that as late as 1863 the Presbyterians were still divided into the "New School" and "Old School," the latter group adhering, if not strictly to the old psalmody, at least to Watts. Indeed, it was in that year that the General Assembly voiced its emphatic disapproval of "those books of Psalmody which, in their arrangement, blot out the distinction between those songs of devotion which are God-inspired and those which are man-inspired." In view of the persistence of this hostile attitude toward hymnody, it can be easily understood why worship life in American Protestantism offered little encouragement to any kind of creative effort.

The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States made a beginning in the transition from psalmody in 1790 when it gave approval to the inclusion of 27 hymns in its Prayer Book. Eighteen years later, 30 more were added. So meager a collection inevitably resulted in dissatisfaction, but it took a minister who came out of the Lutheran Church to arouse his fellow Episcopalians to a realization of their sorry plight. This person was none other than the Rev. William A. Muhlenberg, a grandson of the Lutheran patriarch in America, William Melchior Muhlenberg. In 1821, while yet a young man, he wrote "A Plea for Christian Hymns," which he followed by publishing a collection which he called *Church Poetry*, comprising a selection of hymns and Psalms in verse. As a result of this activity, the General Assembly of the Episcopal Church in 1823 appointed a committee, of which Muhlenberg was a member, to prepare a hymnbook for the Church. This volume, containing a collection of 212 hymns, was approved in 1826. Five American Episcopalians made original contributions to

the collection, including Muhlenberg himself, and it is remarkable how many of these have survived. One of Muhlenberg's was his well-known baptismal hymn, "Saviour, who thy flock art feeding," which, of course, will be found in our Common Hymnal.

Another contributor to this early Episcopal hymnal was the Rev. George Washington Doane, afterwards bishop of New Jersey, who wrote "Softly now the light of day" and "Thou art the way, by thee alone," both of which will appear in the Common Hymnal. The latter is regarded by many as the most outstanding example of American hymnody. A third hymn, "Fling out the banner, let it float," which was written by Doane many years later, will also be included in our collection.

Another famous person who was represented in this unusual Episcopal hymnal was none other than Francis Scott Key, a layman, who contributed "Lord, with glowing heart I'll praise thee." This hymn, which is widely used today, as well as his "Star-spangled Banner," will be found in our new collection.

While on the subject of patriotic hymns, it might be in place to observe here that the Common Hymnal will also contain Julia Ward Howe's "Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord"; Katharine Lee Bates' "O beautiful for spacious skies," and Samuel Francis Smith's "My country, 'tis of thee." In Canadian editions, "God save our gracious queen" will be substituted for the latter. Smith will also be represented in our collection by his missionary hymn, "The morning light is breaking."

The first of our great American poets to make a contribution to our nation's hymnody was William Cullen Bryant. In 1820 a collection of 504 hymns was published in New York City for use by the First Congregational Society, now All Souls' Church of that city. Bryant, who was a member of that congregation, contributed five hymns, but only two of these, "Thou, whose unmeasured temple stands" and "Look from thy sphere of endless day," are in general use today. The latter, the earliest of all American home mission hymns, reveals something of the concern that was already being felt for the spiritual future of the youthful American republic, where the Churches were overwhelmed by the task

of trying to minister to the scattered peoples in distant and ever-widening frontiers. So Bryant prayed:

Look from thy sphere of endless day,
O God of mercy and of might!
In pity look on those who stray,
Benighted, in this land of light.

Another of America's great literary geniuses who lived and wrought at this time was Oliver Wendell Holmes. The author of *The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table* once said, "It would be one of the most agreeable reflections to me, if I could feel that I had left a few (hymns) to be remembered after me." Holmes wrote better than he thought. At least two of his hymns have found general acceptance—"O Love divine, that stooped to share" and "Lord of all being, throned afar"—and certainly our own collection will be the richer for the inclusion of the latter. Something of the poet's own sensitive and reverent spirit may be seen reflected in the fervent lines:

Sun of our Life, thy quickening ray
Sheds on our path the glow of day;
Star of our Hope, thy softened light
Cheers the long watches of the night.

Our midnight is thy smile withdrawn;
Our noontide is thy gracious dawn;
Our rainbow arch, thy mercy's sign;
All, save the clouds of sin, are thine.

From this "golden age" in American literature we also have the deeply cherished hymns of the Quaker poet, John Greenleaf Whittier. Whittier once stated that a hymn is the highest form of poetry, but he did not consider that he had ever written one. Nevertheless, he will be represented in the Common Hymnal with no less than seven lyrics, the largest number of any American writer. Because of the deep religious note that runs through all of Whittier's poems, hymnbook editors have found them a veritable gold

mine of the highest type of hymnody. Where, for instance, will be found in the English language purer poetry or deeper devotion than breathes through the lines:

I know not where His islands lift
Their fronded palms in air;
I only know I cannot drift
Beyond His love and care.
And thou, O Lord, by whom are seen
Thy creatures as they be,
Forgive me if too close I lean
My human heart on thee.

Verses chosen from Whittier's poems vary greatly in different hymnals, wherefore it is often difficult to identify a hymn by its first line, but the following will be found in our collection: "All things are thine; no gift have we," "O brother man, fold to thy heart thy brother," "Dear Lord and Father of mankind," "I bow my forehead to the dust," "Immortal love, forever full," "O Lord and Master of us all," and "I know not what the future hath."

Toward the middle of the nineteenth century, as singing of hymns became more general among all communions in the United States, the number of hymnwriters began to multiply. From this period we have two lovely Christmas lyrics, "Calm on the listening ear of night" and "It came upon a midnight clear," by Edmund Hamilton Sears. The former was pronounced by Oliver Wendell Holmes as "one of the finest and most beautiful hymns ever written," but there are many who feel that the second one, written sixteen years later, is even better. Suffice to say, either one would have given Sears a lasting name in the annals of American hymnody.

From this period also comes what some critics have named as the greatest American hymn. It is Ray Palmer's immortal "My faith looks up to thee." Written in 1832 merely for his own spiritual exercise and edification, Palmer had no idea that it would ever be used as a hymn, but through a providential meeting with Dr. Lowell Mason, the composer, who was then at work on a book of worship, it found its way into *Spiritual Songs*, and ere long it

was on the lips of Christians throughout America. Palmer, of course, will be remembered not only for this noble hymn, but also for his "Jesus thou joy of loving hearts," an exquisite translation of a cento from the Latin *Jesu, dulcis memoria*, as well as for his lovely lyric:

Jesus, these eyes have never seen
That radiant form of thine;
The veil of sense hangs dark between
Thy blessed face and mine.

I see thee not, I hear thee not,
Yet art thou oft with me;
And earth hath ne'er so dear a spot
As where I meet with thee.

Yet though I have not seen, and still
Must rest in faith alone;
I love thee, dearest Lord, and will,
Unseen, but not unknown.

When death these mortal eyes shall seal,
And still this throbbing heart,
The rending veil should thee reveal,
All-glorious as Thou art.

The Abolitionist movement set all the North aflame toward the middle of the nineteenth century, and from the poets of New England came a flood of burning verse that cried out for justice for the black man. Although not written as a hymn, "Once to every man and nation" comes to us from this period, being a cento from James Russell Lowell's stirring poem, "The Present Crisis." From another Abolitionist, William Henry Burleigh, our Common Hymnal will be enriched by the hymn, "Lead us, O Father, in the paths of peace." Burleigh's lyrics have found greater recognition in England than in America.

An amazing number of hymns of the highest order have come from American Unitarians, and not a few have found their way into the orthodox evangelical hymnals of our country. It is not

difficult, of course, to understand why so many of these hymns should satisfy the most discriminating literary standards, since they came out of what was then the very cultural center of America, but it is more of an enigma to explain why so many are sung and cherished by the staunchest of Trinitarians. Edward S. Ninde, in his *Story of the American Hymn*, has a plausible explanation when he writes: "We must remember that the Unitarianism of that day was not what it is now. It was not so much a protest against Trinitarianism as against certain teachings of the older theology. The human heart demanded that the Fatherhood of God be given as large a place as His Sovereignty, that the divine Love and Mercy be made at least co-emphatic with the divine Justice and Wrath."

Certainly no Lutheran would want to see omitted from our Common Hymnal the Lenten hymn, "In the cross of Christ I glory," and yet we are confronted with the fact that it came from the pen of the English Unitarian, Sir John Bowring. The same is true of the two above-mentioned Christmas lyrics written by the New England Unitarian, Edmund Hamilton Sears. All of which simply demonstrates that a hymn must finally be judged, not by the person who wrote it, but by its fidelity to divine revelation, the Christian faith which it reflects, and the spirit of true worship and devotion that breathes through it.

Among earlier Unitarian hymn-writers we have already mentioned Oliver Wendell Holmes and William Henry Burleigh. To this list must also be added the names of Samuel Johnson and Samuel Longfellow, the latter a brother of William Wadsworth Longfellow. These two men collaborated in bringing out two hymnbooks, the first, *Book of Hymns*, in 1846, and a successor to it, *Hymns of the Spirit*, in 1864. They were the first hymnbook editors to see the possibilities of Whittier's poems, and they likewise were the first to introduce Newman's "Lead, kindly Light," into an American hymnal. From Johnson we have the hymn, "City of God, how broad and far," while Longfellow will be represented in our collection by "Holy Spirit, truth divine."

Here also it probably should be mentioned that the English

version of Martin Luther's *Ein' feste Burg* commonly adopted by American hymnals and also chosen for our own collection is by the Unitarian scholar, Frederic Henry Hedge. It appeared for the first time in a hymnal bearing the title, *Hymns for the Church of Christ*, published by Hedge and Frederic D. Huntington in 1853. The latter, a Unitarian minister, afterwards joined the Episcopal Church and became Bishop of Central New York in 1869. With the adoption of this translation, two-thirds of the Lutherans of America will be singing for the first time an identical version of Luther's great battle hymn, and incidentally, the form in which it is also sung by a majority of other Protestant communions. Although less rugged than Carlyle's famous version, it is far easier to sing because of its more regular meter :

A mighty Fortress is our God,
 A Bulwark never failing;
 Our Helper he amid the flood
 Of mortal ills prevailing:
 For still our ancient foe
 Doth seek to work us woe;
 His craft and power are great,
 And, armed with cruel hate,
 On earth is not his equal.

Peer of all Unitarian hymn-writers is Frederick Lucian Hosmer, who is the author of no less than six hymns in our collection. They are: "Not always on the mount may we," "O light from age to age the same," "O Lord of life, where'er they be," "O thou in all thy might so far," "Thy kingdom come, on bended knee," and "Thy kingdom come, O God."

Among Episcopalian hymn-writers who brought forth lyrics during this period was Charles W. Everest, who at the age of nineteen, in 1833, published a little volume of verse in which is found "Take up thy cross," the Saviour said." Bishop Arthur Cleveland Coxe, in 1839, wrote "O where are kings and empires now" as a part of a ballad printed in *The Churchman*. He also was the author of the fine missionary hymn, "Saviour, sprinkle many nations."

Still later, Bishop Phillips Brooks brought forth his immortal Christmas carol, "O little town of Bethlehem," and Bishop William Croswell Doane, a son of Bishop George Washington Doane, followed in the footsteps of his hymn-writer father by giving us "Ancient of Days, who sittest throned in glory." Other Episcopalian hymnists who wrought during the second half of the nineteenth century were Daniel C. Roberts, from whom we have received the stirring and militant "God of our fathers, whose almighty hand," and Mrs. Mary Ann Thomson, who has given to the Church the gripping missionary hymn, "O Sion, haste, thy mission high fulfilling."

With the advent after the Civil War of the so-called "Gospel Songs," we witness a new phenomenon in American religious life. In an effort to revive more general interest in singing, hymnbook compilers set words to popular, "catchy" tunes, usually with a refrain. The text of most of these spiritual songs was usually as inferior as the music, and the themes were often drawn from secular sources. Indeed, the composers sometimes wrote the words as well as the music! As a result, we have the production of songs with such un-Scriptural imagery as "Hold the fort, for I am coming," "Pull for the shore, sailors, pull for the shore," and "Let the lower lights be burning!" If this type of hymnody represents the results achieved when hymns are brought down to the level of the people, it must be confessed that the cultural and spiritual level of the American people is pitifully low. The extraordinary popularity achieved by some of these songs, however, led to the production of almost innumerable song-books, and publication houses vied with one another in getting a share of this profitable business. Sometimes evangelists and "gospel singers" promoted the sale of their own paper-covered products. As a result, the standard hymnals were often crowded out of Protestant worship, particularly in the Methodist, Congregationalist, and Baptist communions, and even Lutheran churches have not been entirely immune to their baneful influence.

Perhaps it would not be fair to say that the gospel song worked no good in American religious life. Undoubtedly it had

its spiritual appeal to simple, illiterate folk; but often it repelled the more intelligent and cultured. In a sense, it cheapened religion. E. Dickinson has expressed the most charitable judgment of this type of hymnody when he writes in his *Music in the History of the Western Church*:

"No one who is acquainted with the history of religious propagation in America will despise the revival hymn, or deny the necessity of the part it has played. But these seasons of spiritual upheaval are temporary and exceptional; they are properly the beginning and not the end of the church's effort. The revival hymn may be effective in soul-winning, it is inadequate when treated as an element in the larger task of spiritual development."

With the passing of the years, it has been possible to separate the gold from the dross, with the result that a few of the gospel songs are finding their way into standard church hymnals. Indeed, there is surprising agreement among hymnbook editors regarding those which seem to possess abiding worth. Gospel hymns that will be found in the Common Hymnal are: Joseph Scriven's "What a Friend we have in Jesus"; William J. Thompson's "Softly and tenderly, Jesus is calling"; John Henry Gilmore's "He leadeth me, O blessed thought"; and Annie Sherwood Hawks' "I need thee every hour."

It is rather pathetic to note that although Fanny Crosby van Alstyne was the most prolific of all writers of gospel hymns, she will not be represented in the Common Hymnal by a single song. The name of the famous blind hymnist who wrote no less than 8,000 spiritual poems during her lifetime and whose songs were on the lips of millions of American worshipers a generation ago is rapidly disappearing from all standard church hymnals. It would seem that room might have been found for at least one of her hymns in our collection.

Two hymns of a rather subjective nature and closely bordering on the gospel hymn style are Sylvanus Dryden Phelps' "Saviour, thy dying love" and Elizabeth Payson Prentiss' "More love to thee, O Christ," both of which have been adopted for our collection because of their warm, devotional character and because

they are in wide use. Here also may be mentioned George Duffield's hymn, "Stand up, stand up for Jesus," which, though quite stirring, can hardly be considered as poetry of a high order.

During the latter part of the nineteenth century, the rise of a social consciousness in American churches was quickly reflected in American hymnody. The growth of great industrial cities, with their attendant problems of poverty, child labor, unemployment, slum conditions, vice and crime, was a matter of great concern to many leaders in the Church. The social implications of the Gospel became the burden of many sermons. Christ's compassion for the weary and the heavy-laden, and His proclamation of redemption for the poor and the broken hearted were keynotes in what came to be known as the "social Gospel." And as the hymn writers took up the theme, we have Samuel Wolcott as early as 1869 singing:

Christ for the world we sing;
The world to Christ we bring
With loving zeal:
The poor and them that mourn,
The faint and overborne,
Sin-sick and sorrow-worn,
Whom Christ doth heal.

And then Washington Gladden, the great Congregational preacher and social reformer, came out in 1879 with his appealing hymn:

O Master, let me walk with thee
In lowly paths of service free;
Tell me thy secret; help me bear
The strain of toil, the fret of care.

Help me the slow of heart to move
By some clear, winning word of love;
Teach me the wayward feet to stay,
And guide them in the homeward way.

Teach me thy patience; still with Thee
In closer, dearer company,
In work that keeps faith sweet and strong,
In trust that triumphs over wrong.

In hope that sends a shining ray
Far down the future's broadening way;
In peace that only thou canst give,
With thee, O Master, let me live.

In 1905, a noted home missions leader of the Methodist Church, Frank Mason North, afterwards a president of the Federal Council of Churches, wrote what is probably the most gripping lyric in American hymnody on the same theme. "Where cross the crowded ways of life" was first published in *The Christian City*, but it had been suggested to North by a member of the Methodist Hymnal Committee. North afterwards wrote: "That it has found its way into so many of the modern hymnals and by translation into so many of the other languages, is significant not as to the quality of the hymn itself but as to the fact that it is an expression of that tremendous movement of the soul of the gospel in our times which demands that the follower of Christ must make the interest of the people his own, and must find the heart of the world's need if he is in any real way to represent his Master among men." All of this is beautifully reflected in the lines:

The cup of water given for thee
Still holds the freshness of thy grace;
Yet long these multitudes to see
The sweet compassion of thy face.

O Master, from the mountain-side,
Make haste to heal these hearts of pain,
Among these restless throngs abide,
O tread the city's streets again.

Till sons of men shall learn thy love,
And follow where thy feet have trod;
Till glorious from thy heaven above
Shall come the city of our God!

Other American hymns of this character which will be found in our collection include Walter Russell Bowie's "O holy city, seen of John"; William Pierson Merrill's "Rise up, O men of God" and

"Not alone for mighty empire," as well as Hosmer's "Thy kingdom come! on bended knee," and a number of others to which we have previously referred. Here also we probably should add Ernest Warburton Shurtleff's "Lead on, O King eternal," which is a stirring call to "deeds of love and mercy," and even Katherine Lee Bates' great patriotic hymn, "America, the Beautiful," has a wistful note on social justice.

Not all of the later American hymns, of course, follow this pattern. Some are hymns of pure worship and devotion, such as Henry van Dyke's exultant "Joyful, joyful, we adore thee," written for *Hymn to Joy* of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony; Maltbie D. Babcock's "This is my Father's world," and Mary Artemesia Lathbury's "Day is dying in the west" and "Break thou the bread of life."

From the pen of the late Presbyterian hymnologist, Louis F. Benson, our collection has been enriched by two items, "For the bread, which thou has broken" and "O thou whose feet have climbed life's hill." Another Presbyterian clergyman, Daniel March, wrote "Hark, the voice of Jesus calling" in 1868, and Edward Hopper, who ministered to sailors in the Church of the Sea and Land, New York, gave the Church a seamen's hymn, "Jesus, Saviour, pilot me," in 1871.

Since the turn of the century, most of the newer hymns have continued to emphasize the Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and the redemption of the social order. Two suicidal world conflicts have also inspired a number of hymns that give expression to the universal yearning for peace. One of the finest of the modern hymns, "God of grace and God of glory," by Harry Emerson Fosdick, was originally a part of our collection, but, unfortunately, was subsequently dropped. The late Henry Hallam Tweedy, professor of practical theology at Yale from 1909 to 1937, fared better when his fine hymn on the Holy Spirit was adopted:

O Spirit of the living God,
Thou Light and Fire divine;
Descend upon thy Church once more
And make it truly thine!

Fill it with love and joy and power,
With righteousness and peace,
Till Christ shall dwell in human hearts,
And sin and sorrow cease.

A very recent hymn on prayer, "Now once again for help that never faileth," is from the pen of a woman, Mildred Whitney Stillman. It appeared for the first time as a hymn in the *Episcopal Hymnal*, 1940. Another new American hymn introduced to American worshipers by that very excellent hymnbook is Bates Gilbert Burt's "O God of youth, whose Spirit," written in 1935 for a high school commencement in Pontiac, Mich. Both of these will appear in our collection, as well as a hymn by the well-known Episcopalian preacher and theologian, Howard Chandler Robbins, bearing the title, "Put forth, O God, thy Spirit's might." The latter appeared for the first time in H. Augustine Smith's *New Church Hymnal*, of which Robbins was an associate editor.

A number of original hymns by American Lutheran authors will also appear in the *Common Hymnal*, but space does not permit a more extensive review here. The new hymnbook will likewise be enriched, we believe, by a number of original tunes which were written for specific texts suggested by the Commission.

Those who are eagerly looking forward to the appearance of this first effort to produce a hymnal which is intended to serve the majority of the Lutherans in America will probably be happy to learn that the hymn which won such acclaim at the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam in 1948, and thus became an international hymn as well as an ecumenical hymn almost overnight, will also be included in our collection. We refer to "Thine is the glory."

We will bring this series of articles to a close by referring to two anonymous hymns which likewise have been adopted. The first begins with the line, "The wise may bring their learning," and the other is a lyric which appeared for the first time in the *Pilgrim Hymnal* of 1904 with no author given. It is evidently of American

origin, but it is a matter of deepest regret to the Commission that these beautiful words must be printed without a credit line:

I sought the Lord, and afterward I knew
He moved my soul to seek him, seeking me;
It was not I that found, O Saviour true;
No, I was found of thee.

Thou didst stretch forth thy hand and mine enfold;
I walked and sank not on the storm-vexed sea;
'Twas not so much that I on thee took hold,
As thou, dear Lord, on me.

I find, I walk, I love, but, O the whole
Of love is but my answer, Lord, to thee,
For thou wert long beforehand with my soul,
Always thou lovedst me.

The Church of Christ According to Luther

UURAS SAARNIVAARA

IN 1927 Otto Dibelius, a renowned German theologian, now the bishop of Berlin, published a book entitled *The Century of the Church*. The title has become a slogan, and the present century is frequently called the century of the Church.

In the past few decades the doctrine of the Church has been a topic of intense discussion in a number of Lutheran Churches, and the teaching of Luther has played an important role in it. In Sweden this discussion began with Gustaf Aulén's study *Till Belysning af den lutherska kyrkoiden* (Light upon the Lutheran idea of the Church), 1912. At the theological conference of Nyköping, 1942, all the lectures dealt with the doctrine of the Church, and an important part of them expounded the teachings of Luther. The lectures were published the following year as an extensive volume *En bok om kyrkan* (A book on the Church). In Germany a number of books dealing particularly with Luther's teaching of the Church have been published. One of the most valuable of them is Paul Althaus' book *Communio sanctorum. Die Gemeinde im lutherischen Kirchengedanken* (The communion of saints. The congregation in the Lutheran idea of the Church), 1929. In Finland L. P. Tapaninen published in 1942 his study *Lutherin kirkonäkemys* (Luther's concept of the Church), and in 1946 appeared Martti Simojoki's book *Kirkko* (The Church). A remarkable fact is that one of the first studies of Luther published during the now dawning "Luther renaissance" in America is Dr. Herman A. Preus' work *The Communion of Saints*, 1948, a good account of Luther's way to his evangelical understanding of the Church and of his reformation teaching. A symptom of the increasing interest in the doctrine of the Church is the fact that both guest lecturers (Professors Arthur Vööbus of Maywood and Jaroslav

Pelikan of St. Louis) at the Pastor's Institute of Suomi Theological Seminary, Hancock, Mich., in April, 1951, chose for their topics certain aspects of the Church and its fundamental principles.

1. LUTHER'S TEACHING AS AN OUTCOME OF HIS STRUGGLE AGAINST THE ROMISH AND FANATIC VIEWS

The Christian Church has two basic aspects; it is: 1) the communion or fellowship of believers, and 2) an agent of God for the salvation of men. The Church is the body of Christ, in which all the believers are members under one Head, called to mutual fellowship in faith and love. Christ performs His work of calling men and bringing them into His kingdom through the ministry of His Church. The Head acts through His members.

The Roman Church accepts these basic ideas of the Church, but it lays emphasis on the institutional aspect of the Church and holds that only the ordained priesthood is the agent through which Christ saves men. The general priesthood of believers is not recognized at all in the scriptural sense. The Word is not regarded as a means of grace but as a "heavenly philosophy." Baptism and penance are the chief means of grace. They are called the "sacraments of the dead," for through them the divine healing and sanctifying grace is infused into men who are spiritually dead. The other sacraments confirm faith or increase grace to those who already are spiritually alive, or, as the sacrament of ordination, give power to administer the sacraments.

According to the Roman doctrine, the saving grace comes to man in this order:

GOD

CHRIST

THE CHURCH

THE CLERGY

THE SACRAMENTS

MAN¹

1 Eino Sormunen, *Jumalan armo* (The Grace of God) II. Luther (Helsinki, 1934), pp. 153 ff., 182, Werner Elert, *Morphologie des Luthertums* I (München, 1931), p. 157, E. Klotsche, *Christian Symbolics* (Burlington, Iowa, 1929), pp. 99 f.

Luther was convinced that much of this Catholic doctrine was correct and biblical. God certainly was the ultimate cause or author of salvation, Christ was the Mediator and the "meritorious cause," and the saving grace was bestowed upon man through the means of grace which Christ had entrusted to the Christian priesthood. The Roman Church had, however, adulterated this scriptural view so that it had become an expression of a hierarchic Church and a mechanized conception of grace and salvation. In opposing the Romish doctrine Luther returned to the biblical view that the proclamation of the Gospel is the chief means whereby God bestows upon men His pardoning and renewing grace. The sacraments are true means of grace, but are subordinate to the proclamation of the Gospel. He also opposed the doctrine that the ordained clergy alone is the priesthood of the Church. According to his teaching, the only true priesthood is the royal priesthood of believers. Since this priesthood also makes up the membership of the Church, the Christian Church as a whole is a holy priestly people of God.

The second front at which Luther had to fight was that against the Protestant extremists, *Schwarmgeister*, fanatics. In their view the Church, to be sure, is the communion of saints, but it is not a necessary agent of God for the salvation of men. The Spirit of God does not need any external agents and means in bestowing the divine grace upon men. He does it directly through His miraculous working in hearts. Against this fanatic view Luther emphasized the truth that God works in this world through visible and audible means, not directly, without them.² The Church is both the communion of saints and God's agent for the proclamation of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments, for only through them does God give His grace and Spirit to men.

In the present study we will pay chief attention to the first aspect of the Church, the aspect of fellowship or communion.

2 Cf. Aulén, *Till belysning af den lutherska kyrkoiden*, p. 15; Tapaninen, *op. cit.*, pp. 38, 72.

2. THE CHURCH AS THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS

In the Apostles' Creed we confess our faith in the holy universal ("catholic") Church, the communion of saints. Luther centers his teaching of the Christian Church on the truth expressed in these words. "I believe," he says, "that there is on earth a flock or congregation of mere saints, under one Head, even Christ, called together by the Holy Spirit in one faith, mind, and understanding."³

When Luther speaks of the Church of Christ he does not mean any ecclesiastical organization but the communion of saints, or the "holy people of God," as he often calls it.⁴ The true Church is composed of "mere saints" or Christians, believers. They are the body of Christ. Luther often designates it by the name "the holy Christendom (*heilige Christenheit*)" or "congregation of saints (*Gemeinde der Heiligen*)."⁵ In the *Smalcald Articles* he says that "the Church is the saints, the believers and sheep who hear their Shepherd's voice. . . . This holiness is in the word of God and in truth faith."⁶

In using such terms Luther wants to emphasize that the true Church is no external community or denomination; it is the flock or fellowship of men who live in true faith and are God's saved children. It is not the external Christendom when looked at with the eyes of faith, but the "flock" of such people who believe in Christ as their Savior and follow Him.⁷

"Scripture speaks of Christendom quite simply," Luther says, "and it uses the term in one sense only. . . . According to the Scriptures, the Christendom is called the assembly of all the believers in Christ on earth, as we pray in the Creed, 'I believe in the Holy Spirit, the communion of saints.' This community or assembly is made up of all those who live in true faith, hope, and love. Thus, the essence, life, and nature of Christendom is not a bodily assembly but an assembly of hearts in one faith, as St. Paul says in Ephesians 4, 'One baptism, one faith, one Lord.' Therefore, even if they would be a thousand miles apart in body, yet they are called an assembly in

3 WA. 30, I, 190, *Large Catechism*, 1529.

4 E.g. WA. 50, 628 ff., *On the Councils and Churches*, 1539 (Holman ed. V, 269).

5 WA. 30, I, 189 f., *Large Catechism*, 1529.

6 WA. 50, 250.

7 Cf. Preus, *op. cit.*, pp. 78 f.

spirit, since every one preaches, believes, hopes, loves, and lives like the other. . . . It is a spiritual unity, on account of which men are called the communion of saints. And this unity is of itself enough to constitute the Christendom, and without it no unity, be it of place, of time, of person, of work, or of whatever else, makes the Christendom. On this point we must hear the word of Christ, . . . 'My kingdom is not of this world.' This passage makes it clear that Christendom is different from all temporal communities, since it is nothing external. . . . Christ says even more plainly in Luke 17, 'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here, or Lo, there: for behold, the kingdom of God is within you. . . .' Therefore, whosoever holds that an external assembly or an external unity makes the Christendom, sets forth arbitrarily what is merely his own opinion, and whoever tries to prove it by the Scriptures, brings the divine truth to the support of his lies."⁸

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP

Since only true believers belong to the true Christendom, the body of Christ, it is plain that membership in a church body does not make a person a member of the communion of saints. Therefore, only a part of the membership of historical denominations belongs to the body of Christ, which is always much smaller in size than the external Christendom. "It is clear," Luther says, "that external fellowship with the Roman Church (*Versammlung*) does not make men Christians. . . . To be a member of the Roman Church does not mean that the person is in true faith, and if a person is outside of it, it does not mean that he is in unbelief. . . . Whoever, therefore does not desire to go astray should hold fast to this that the Christendom is a spiritual assembly of souls in one faith, and that no one is counted as a Christian for the sake of his body. . . . The real, true, essential Christendom is a spiritual thing, and not anything external or outward, by whatever name it may be called. For a person who is not a Christian may have all those other things, but they will never make him a Christian if he does not have faith, which alone makes Christians."⁹

A person does not belong to the body of Christ as to his ex-

8 WA. 6, 292 f., *The Papacy at Rome*, 1520 (Holman edition I, 349 f.).

9 *Ibid.*, 294 f. (Holman ed. I, 351 f.).

ternal life in this world, not even through his external membership in a Church, but only through his spiritual fellowship with God. Neither does he belong to it as to his old man, flesh, which is a part of this world and the kingdom of evil, but only as to his new man, which is ruled by Christ. But the boundary between the true Church and this world does not go only between the old man and the new man;¹⁰ it goes primarily between men, those who have true faith and those who have not; for man is Christian or non-Christian as to his person. True Christians are, of course, members of the external Christendom as long as they live in this world; but since many members of the external Churches have no true faith, relationship between the external Christendom or Church and the spiritual, true Church can be illustrated (as to their size) with two concentric circles: the smaller one represents the body of Christ, the larger one the membership of the external Christendom.¹¹

10 E.g. Helge Nyman asserts such a view as the Lutheran one, *Den bidande tron hos Paavo Ruotsalainen* (Helsinki, 1949), p. 315.

11 R. Seeberg, *Studien zur Geschichte des Begriffs der Kirche*, pp. 99, 224, and *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte II*, 278 (according to Aulén, *op. cit.*, p. 51), uses the idea of two concentric circles in his description of the relationship between the external Christendom and the true Church. Aulén criticizes this "quantitative" distinction between the two churches and regards the picture of two circles as misleading. He prefers another illustration, "a transparent picture which looks entirely different when set against light than otherwise. . . . The unbeliever sees only the contours of the outward community, but he does not see any church at all. The Church is visible to faith alone. . . . The picture is the same, but its look changes through the action of the light. . . . Faith sees . . . that . . . the external Christendom is as to its inmost essence God's Church and the communion of saints through the fact that, and as far as, it is a community created by the Gospel" (Aulén, *ibid.*).

Much of what Aulén says here is right. It is true that the true Church is visible to faith alone. We cannot, however, agree with Aulén in the rejection of the "quantitative" aspect of the matter. Luther certainly speaks of the external Church or Christendom as a thing that is larger than the true Church, that is, an entity that has a larger extent in the quantitative sense. Actually this idea seems to be implied in Aulén's statement that the outward Christendom is the true Church or communion of saints "as far as it is a community created by the Gospel." The external Christendom is a Gospel-created community as far as there are true believers in it. The number of true believers is always smaller than the total number of people belonging to the external Christendom. It is impossible to avoid the idea of a quantitative difference between the outward Christendom and the communion of saints.

In our view, both ideas are necessary: The idea of a quantitative difference between

When Luther emphasizes the truth that membership in a congregation or church body as such does not make a person a Christian, he naturally wants to urge people not to be satisfied with mere external and formal membership and so deceive themselves; they should seek to have a true saving faith from God through repentance and trust in Christ.

Luther had the same fundamental view of the Church already in his pre-reformation period. In his lectures on the Psalms, 1513-1515, he emphasized that the unbelieving members of the external Church were not members of Christ. "Christ is not the Lord of prostitutes who live in brothels, neither is He the head of murderers, heretics, and scoundrels. . . . For the head must be attached to the body . . . , and the members must be dependent on the Head, on whom their life and activity depends. Therefore Christ cannot be the head of an evil community."¹²

The *Apology* of the Augsburg Confession teaches the same thing regarding the Church as did Luther when it explains: "The Church is not only the fellowship of outward objects and rites, . . . but it is originally a fellowship of faith and of the Holy Spirit in hearts. . . . And this Church alone is called the body of Christ, which Christ renews, sanctifies, and governs by His Spirit. . . . Wherefore, those in whom Christ does not work (through His Spirit) are not members of Christ. . . . The wicked are dead members of the Church. For the wicked are ruled by the devil and are captives of the devil; they are not ruled by the Spirit of Christ."¹³

THE HIDDENNESS OF THE CHURCH

Since the faith of the heart, and Christ who dwells in the hearts of His believers, are invisible, the Church of Christ or the

the two churches, and the idea that Aulén sets forth in the illustration that he uses: the true Church is visible to faith alone. There is no either-or choice in the use of the two illustrations, for they set forth two different aspects of the matter.—Cf. Preus, *op. cit.*, pp. 89 f.

¹² WA. 4, 401, 22.

¹³ Articles 7 and 8.—Simojoki, *op. cit.*, p. 43 f., says that only believers are true members of the body of Christ; "the others are dead members of Christ's body." We cannot agree. Unbelievers are not at all members of the body of Christ, for it has no dead members. They are dead members of the external Church, but not of the body of Christ.

communion of saints is invisible. It is usual that the following words from Luther's book *On the Bondage of the Will* (1525) are quoted as an expression of the view of Luther: "The Church is hidden, the saints are concealed (*abscondita est ecclesia, latent sancti*)."¹⁴ When these words have been quoted one fact has usually been overlooked: They are a part of a quotation from Erasmus' *Diatrobe*, against which Luther is writing. True, he does not criticize these words. They can, nevertheless, hardly be used as a proof of what Luther teaches. His conception is seen from his statement, "It is necessary that the Church, which is sinless, also is invisible; it is perceptible to faith alone."¹⁵

The true Church or the communion of saints is invisible in the sense that it is no external community or organization. "No one can see or feel the holy Christian Church, nor say, Lo, here; lo, there. For what a person believes he does not see or observe, as St. Paul teaches in Hebrews 11. Furthermore, what a person sees or feels, he does not believe."¹⁶ We confess that we believe the holy universal Church, not that we see and feel it.¹⁷

The Church is not, however, invisible in the sense that it is wholly unknown and impossible to be observed. Luther says expressly that it is known to faith. It is made up of men who are visible beings, and who can have a concrete and real fellowship with one another. The faith and the Spirit in the hearts are invisible, but their presence can be known by the fruits of the Spirit, that is, confession of the mouth, works of love, and holiness of walk. It is, nevertheless, not always easy to recognize the presence of the Church by the fruits of the Spirit, for in practical life they are mixed with weaknesses and sins, and often even covered under them. The Christians are not yet wholly sanctified. Their weaknesses and sins may lead even other Christians to err in their judg-

14 WA. 18, 652, 23. E.g. Herbert Olsson, "Kyrkans synlighet och fördoldhet enligt Luther," *En bok om kyrkan*, pp. 322 f., and Eino Sormunen, *Kerjäläisiä me olemme* (Beggars we are), (Helsinki, 1947), p. 85, use these words as a "proof-text" of the teaching of Luther.

15 WA. 7, 710, Against Catharinus, 1521.

16 WA. 7, 684, according to Preus, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

17 WA. 7, 710.

ment. Great humility and love is needed in the matter. "Christ wants to be," Luther says, "at the same time hidden and manifest; He allows Himself to be found and not found. Therefore He permits that among the fruits of the Spirit, by which we can know Him and be healed in Him, slip some faults, and thus He hides Himself so that malicious judges are offended at Him." "There are among them [the Christians] many who are faulty at all or at least some of these points in order that hypocrites would have something for what to blame the elect, the beloved of God, and at what they can be offended; and that the true saints also would have some people concerning whom they can exercise mercy, humility, meekness, and longsuffering."¹⁸

Luther thinks here that Christians in general recognize one another when they become acquainted with one another. They are not, however, inerrant in this recognition, for their remaining sins and faults cause mistakes. This danger of erring concerning the communion of saints and its members is not as great in the case of humble and loving Christians as it is in the case of those who are obsessed with a haughty and critical spirit.

Luther himself is conscious of living in the communion of saints. He has come to know it by hearing the saving Gospel and by experiencing the renewing work of the Holy Spirit in the midst of and through the service of believing people. He writes in his *Large Catechism*, "I believe that there is on earth a holy assembly and congregation of pure saints, under one Head, even Christ. . . . I also am a part and member of the same, a partaker and joint owner of all the good it possesses, brought to it and incorporated into it by the Holy Spirit, where I have heard and continue to hear the word of God, which is the means of entrance. For formerly, before we had attained to this, we were of the devil, knowing nothing of God and Christ. Thus, until the last day the Holy Spirit abides with the holy congregation of Christian people. By means of this congregation He brings us to Christ, and through it He teaches and preaches the Word to us."¹⁹

18 WA. 17, II, 1117, 115, *Church Postil*, 5th Sunday after Epiphany, epistle sermon.

19 WA. 30, I, 190, third article of the Creed.

THE EXPERIENCE OF THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS

The communion of saints is the kingdom of Christ on earth. It is His body through which He acts and proclaims the Gospel. "Christ established upon the earth a comforting and blessed kingdom when He said, 'As my Father hath sent me, so send I you.' He consecrated us all priests in order that one may proclaim to the other the forgiveness of sins."²⁰ Thus, the forgiveness of sins is received and experienced in the fellowship of believers. It is in the Christian Church that God forgives sins, as Luther says in the *Small Catechism*. Through the Gospel the Church is the "mother" who gives birth to new children of God. "The Church . . . is the freewoman, appointed by God to be on earth—not in heaven—the mother of us all, of whom we were born and are born every day. . . . She gives birth by the Holy Spirit, through the ministry of the Word and sacraments."²¹

Thus, the knowledge of the Church, the communion of saints, is "inborn" to a Christian in the sense that it is based on his experience of salvation through the Church-proclaimed Gospel. The believer is not only a child of God but also a child of the Church. As such he knows his "mother," the Church, because of his birth of her and by his dependence on her in his spiritual life and growth.

20 WA. 49, 150, *Church Postil*, 1st Sunday after Easter, gospel sermon.

21 WA. 40, I, 663, *Commentary on Galatians*, 4:7.—According to the common view of modern Protestantism, and even of Lutheranism, the spiritual priesthood of believers means that each man is his own priest, entitled to approach God directly. T. A. Kantonen, *Resurgence of the Gospel* (Philadelphia, 1948), pp. 146, 160 ff., is right in emphasizing that this is a false view of the teaching of Luther. Even Spener, who revived the emphasis on the universal priesthood of Christians to counteract lifeless orthodoxy, understood it largely as the individual's right to pray and study the Word. When Luther speaks of the spiritual priesthood of Christians he means their task and authority to work as co-laborers of God for the salvation of other people. Priesthood is not an office for man himself but a ministry for others. "Every Christian is a king for himself, a priest for others (*rex pro se, sacerdos pro aliis*," WA. 16, 407, 34, a sermon on Exodus 14, 1525). Nobody can serve himself as a priest, for "no one baptizes himself, nor declares absolution to himself, but he receives baptism and absolution from others" (WA. 6, 514, *On the Misuse of Masses*, 1521). The theology of Lund blames the post-Lutheran theology and Christianity for egocentricity, and to a certain extent it seems to have justice in doing so. At least it is evident in the question of the meaning of priesthood: While Luther understood it as a service to others, the later Lutheranism has understood it as a service to man himself.

"We are born through the Gospel of that freewoman, Sarah, that is, the Church, to be true heirs of the promise. She instructs us, nourishes us, and carries us in her womb, in her lap, and in her arms; she forms and fashions us into the image of Christ, until we grow up to a perfect man."²²

The communion of saints is, therefore, an eminently practical thing in the life of Christians. Salvation and life in Christ and union with Him, the Head, is experienced in and through union with His body, the Church. This is what John means when he unites "walk in the light," the Christians' "fellowship with one another," and "cleansing in the blood of Christ" (I John 1:7). The meaning of this statement of the apostle is identical with the statement of Luther in his *Small Catechism*, that God forgives our sins in the Christian Church. In order that this would come true it is necessary that Christians have fellowship, not only in the church organization ("sandpile fellowship") and in the work of the Church, but also through mutual openness as to their sins and faults and mutual consolation and help through the Gospel. Confession and absolution should not be a mere official sacred act like the sacraments; it should be an expression of the fellowship and mutual help of Christians in general. One of the main reasons why confession and absolution has fallen into disrepute is the fact that they have become an official sacred act and have largely ceased to be a natural part of the life of the fellowship of saints.

3. THE MARKS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CHURCH

THE WORD AND THE SACRAMENTS

The fruits of the Spirit, or the confession of faith, mutual love, and holy walk of Christians are signs whereby the presence of the communion of saints is known. There are, however, several other expressions of the life of the Church which show its presence. The preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacra-

22 WA. 40, I, 663, Gal. 4:7.

ments are the most important of them. These functions render some kind of organization indispensable, but this is only for practical reasons. Ecclesiastical organization does not belong to the marks of the Church, for it is of human origin. Even the office of preaching and the sacraments as such are no sufficient sign of the presence of the body of Christ, for the devil, the great imitator of Christ, uses similar things in his work. The devil's church, Luther says, "is furnished far more than God's with sacraments, prophets, apostles, and evangelists. His chapels are far larger than the church of God; and he has far more people who observe his holiness than God has in His. Moreover, people believe more easily and gladly in his promises, his sacraments, his prophets, than in Christ's. . . . By means of this apery he draws people away from faith in Christ and causes the Word and the sacraments of Christ to be despised."²³

Luther points here to the fact that a large proportion of "church" work in this world belongs to the activity of the devil rather than Christ. The prince of darkness is a master in "aping" Christ and His Church. Much of the preaching that is performed in the various church bodies is no true preaching of the Word of God. And since the sacraments depend on the preaching and teaching of the Word they too are in the service of the devil when the preaching and teaching is. Therefore, even where people live in the sphere of organized church work, they know where the body of Christ is only if they have faith.

There are many people who are not believers but try to follow certain Christian principles in their life. They do it in a legalistic sense, thinking that by avoiding sins and observing the law they will be saved. In a certain sense this is a working of the Church of Christ, namely, where this Church is present. But these people do not really know what the Church is and where it is. They assume that it is an institution that requires of them certain works, like attendance of services, use of sacraments, financial support, avoidance of certain things called sins, etc. But they do not know the

²³ WA. 50, 645 f., *On the Councils and the Churches*, 1539 (Holman ed. V, 291).—Cf. Tapaninen, *op. cit.*, pp. 29 f.

true nature of the Church and have no real idea of its presence.²⁴ They may even regard the communion of saints, when they come into contact with it, as a hateful heretical sect and not the Church, as the Catholics did with regard to the Lutherans and as even many nominal Lutherans have done with regard to truly believing Lutherans.

As long as a person lacks a living faith he may know the Church of Christ in the sense that he sees believing people, hears the Word, and sees the sacraments administered, etc.; but he does not understand their meaning. If he is an altogether unconcerned sinner, the things that belong to the Church are to him "naked facts." If his conscience is awakened so that he feels the demanding and condemning power of the law, the Church is present to him as a demand and judgment, that is, as the law. When a convicted sinner hears the Gospel and hungers and thirsts after righteousness, he begins to have a hazy idea of the true nature of the Church and of its presence; but only after coming to faith he really knows what it is and where it is.²⁵

24 Herbert Olsson, "Kyrkans synlighet och osynlighet enligt Luther" (The visibility and invisibility of the Church according to Luther), *En bok om kyrkan*, p. 320, writes, "When a person is admonished by the law and obeys it, . . . this is a visible expression of the Church, be it done in faith or not; for it is driven forth through the Word that is present in the Church. . . . Consequently Luther can in . . . the book *On the Councils and the Church* . . . give as marks whereby the Church is known the works that are performed in accordance with the second table. . . . Therefore the Church, or the Word that is present in the Church is, in a sense, visible also to a person who lacks faith, namely, as a law."

True, in a very broad sense of the word the works which the teaching of the Church "drives forth" from unbelievers are effects of the Church. Nevertheless, Luther calls them never marks of the Church. In the passage to which Olsson refers (WA. 50, 643, Holman ed. V, 287 f.) Luther speaks of the fruits of the Spirit and not of works of the law done by unbelievers.

25 Paul Althaus, "Theologie des Glaubens," *Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie*, vol. II, pp. 305, 308, explains that, according to Luther, faith alone knows the Church: where faith is absent there the revelation of God in Christ and the word proclaimed by the Church are "naked facts (*nuda facta*)." Olsson, *op. cit.*, pp. 318, holds that this view of Althaus is un-Lutheran. According to Olsson, Luther teaches that God is always present in the Word that the Church proclaims, but this presence is law to the unbelievers. Their knowledge of God is a legalistic knowledge. Althaus is not right in holding that there is only a faith-knowledge of God.

In our view, Althaus and Olsson are both partly right and partly wrong. Olsson is right in saying that, according to Luther, there is a knowledge of God through the law.

The *Augsburg Confession*, though written by Melanchthon, sets forth well Luther's view of the Church when it states, "The Church is the congregation of saints (the assembly of all believers), in which the Gospel is rightly taught (purely preached) and the sacraments rightly administered (according to the Gospel).

It has become customary in large "Lutheran" circles to read these words something like this: The Church is an organization where the Gospel is preached and the sacraments administered. The words that the Church is the congregation of saints are often overlooked. Yet, it is in these words that the nature or essence of the Church is defined. The preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments are its functions whereby it is built both by adding new members to it and by nourishing and guiding the existing membership. They are true signs of the true Church of Christ only when they are (1) done in the congregation of saints, and (2) when this takes place purely, according to the Gospel. In the formal sense, but not "according to the Gospel," preaching and administration of the sacraments can be exercised by an organization which is not a Church of Christ but a community ruled by the devil, as Luther states in a passage quoted above.

THE EIGHT MARKS OF THE CHURCH

In his book *On the Councils and the Churches* (1539) Luther speaks of the eight marks of the Church. The first two of them, the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments, have already been mentioned. In speaking of the preaching of the Word Luther stresses that the means "the external word which is preached publicly by men, such as you and I, . . . the spoken word, when it is truly believed and publicly confessed before the world, . . . and where people live according to it." The formal practice of preaching is no guarantee of the presence of the Church, but the

But this knowledge is not a right and true knowledge. Althaus probably means a true knowledge of God, and man can have it only by faith. Olsson's words about the legalistic knowledge of God apply only to those whose conscience is awake at least to some extent. Althaus is right concerning those who are wholly unconcerned about God and their salvation.

Word must also be truly believed, confessed, and followed in life. Where this is the case, "there you may without doubt believe the holy universal Church (*Ecclesia sancta catholica*) to exist, that is, the Christian holy people, even if it have only a few members. . . . For the word of God cannot be without God's people, and conversely, God's people cannot exist without the Word of God." The sacraments of baptism and holy communion, in like manner, are signs of the people of God when they are rightly administered, taught, used, and believed, not when they are merely formally administered.

The fourth mark of the holy people of God is the use of the power of the keys.²⁶ "When you observe," Luther says, "that at a certain place the sins of some people are forgiven or retained, publicly and privately, know that God's people are there; for if the people of God be not there, neither are the keys there; and if the keys are not there, neither are God's people there. Christ bequeathed them as a public mark and sacred treasure whereby the Holy Spirit, acquired by Christ's death, restores holiness to fallen sinners; by means of them Christians also confess that they are a holy people, subject to Christ, in this world. Those who do not desire to be converted and sanctified again are to be cast out of this holy people; that is, they must be bound and excluded by means of the keys." It is not enough that a church body or denomination has the correct doctrine of the keys in its catechisms and textbooks of dogmatics. They must be used in the everyday life of the Church. Luther says that only where one sees this to be done can he conclude that the people of God are there.

The fifth mark of Church is the calling and consecration of the ministers of the Church (*Kirchendiener*). This is no mere human function, but an "institution of Christ, as St. Paul says in Ephesians 4, . . . 'and gave some to be apostles, prophets, evangelists,

26 Luther uses here—and so he does in most cases—the term "keys" in its narrow or strict sense, of the personal declaration of forgiveness and retaining of sins, or loosing and binding. Sometimes he uses this term in the larger sense, of the use of the means of grace in general, including preaching, the administration of sacraments, the personal absolution, and binding, to sins, or ban.

teachers, . . .” “We must have bishops, pastors or preachers to give, administer, and use publicly and privately the four things or sacred treasures that we have mentioned [that is, the preaching of the word, baptism, holy communion, and the use of the keys] for the sake of and in the name of the Church.” The ministers do this as members of the holy people of God and as its authorized representatives, according to Christ’s institution.

The sixth mark of the Church is public prayer, praise, and thanksgiving, the singing of hymns and spiritual songs in true faith, the use of the Creed, and the other parts of the catechism.

The seventh mark of the holy people of God is the suffering of persecution on the part of the world and temptations from the devil, world, and the flesh, for the sake of Christ. Luther calls this the “**holy cross**”:

“The holy Christian Church . . . must endure all hardship and persecution, all kinds of temptation and evil . . . from the devil, world, and the flesh; it must be inwardly sad, timid, terrified; outwardly poor, despised, sick, weak; thus it becomes like its head, Christ. The reason is necessarily the fact that it holds fast to Christ and the word of God and therefore suffers for Christ’s sake, according to Matthew 5, ‘Blessed are they that are persecuted for my sake.’ ”²⁷

As the eighth mark of the Church Luther mentions the fruits of the Spirit according to the second table of the law, that is, the attitude of love and good works toward fellow men. He adds, however, that these works are no sure and unmistakable mark because even

27 Olsson, *op. cit.*, pp. 314-316, explains that Luther’s meaning in this statement is: “The law commands and accuses even the believing person. And thereby the person who stands in faith is also set constantly anew before the wrath of God. The saints become terrified (*verzagte, blöde*) and fall into unrest. They become thus, like the Head of the Church, constantly anew afflicted, for when they experience the wrath of God through the law, they get into mistrust concerning the love of God. It is this that Luther means when he in the book *Von den Konziliis und Kirchen*, as has been quoted, says that it has the holy cross whereby it is recognized.” This interpretation of Olsson is not correct, for Luther does not say here—or anywhere—that the cross of Christians is the law which terrifies them. He says that not only the persecutions but also the sadness, timidity, and terrors that belong to the holy cross are caused by the devil, the world, and flesh. The holy cross is suffering for the sake of Christ, not for the sake of the law of God. True, the law too terrifies the Christian, and Luther speaks of it frequently, but he never calls it the holy cross of Christians.

the heathen can outwardly do similar acts, although they do not do them in faith and with the willingness and love of the heart.²⁸

The holy people of God, the true Church, has *all* these marks. The want of some of them is an indication that the people of God are not present. If, for instance, overt impenitent sinners are not bound to their sins and excluded from the fellowship of the Church, after they have been admonished, and if penitent sinners are not absolved or loosed from their sins by means of the Gospel, the true Church is not there. God's people cannot exist without the use of the "keys." Likewise, if a congregation or church body has only liturgical singing and prayer in its services, but spontaneous public prayer and praise is wanting, and a public confession of faith and testimony for Christ is absent, the people of God cannot be there. Again, if a congregation or church body gets along with this world so well that it does not suffer anything because of its testimony, this is a sign that the fellowship of saints is not there.

THE HOLINESS OF THE CHURCH

Luther is well aware of the fact that a historical ecclesiastical body or congregation at large may lack most of these marks in their true sense because true believers constitute a small minority in it. He holds, however, that even such a congregation or church body can be called holy on account of the holy nucleus, the small flock of Christians within it. Luther refers to the churches of Galatia, where the great majority of Christians had fallen from the true faith. Nevertheless, Paul called it holy since "there were a few good people who had not rebelled and who had the right understanding of the Word and sacraments." Luther goes on to say that even if an ecclesiastical body is ruled by Antichrist (like that of Rome), the "holy congregation" is left there, for it "must be preserved among men." The true Church continued to exist even during the darkest Middle Ages.²⁹

When an ecclesiastical organization has gone so far astray

28 WA. 50, 628-643 (Holman ed. V, 270-288).

29 WA. 40, I, 70, 23, Gal. 1:2.—Cf. Tapaninen, *op. cit.*, pp. 89-93.

that it "is ruled by spiritual tyrants," it is called holy *per synechdochen*, that is, on account of the few Christians who are left in the midst of it and because of the Word (that is at least in the Bible and the Scripture lessons read in services) and sacraments.³⁰ Luther obviously means: although the Word and sacraments are misused by the majority of the membership of such a church body, they are rightly used by the few true Christians. Among them they work true faith, for they "are not fulfilled when they are used, unless they are believed."³¹

Such circumstances are abnormal; a church body where the truth of God's Word does not determine teaching and practice at large is no true Church, even though the body of Christ is there in the few Christians. Luther gives in his *Church Postil* a description of what he thinks of the Church in its "normal" condition:

"The Church on earth—we speak of the external community—is the assembly of people who hear, believe, and confess the true doctrine of the Gospel, and who have the Holy Spirit who sanctifies them and works in them by means of the Word and sacraments. There are, however, among them some false Christians and hypocrites who, nevertheless, commonly hold to the same doctrine, receive the sacraments with others, and enjoy the outward privileges of the Church. For the true Christians must suffer such people in their congregation; being humans, they cannot hinder and avoid having them in their midst, neither can they cut them off or separate them from their congregation."³²

People who hear, believe, and confess the Gospel, and have the holy Spirit constitute the Church, the body of Christ. The hypocrites are in their midst in the external Church but do not belong to the true Church. The holiness of the Church is due to the fact that, first, it is made up of holy people, saints, who are sanctified by Christ and the Holy Spirit in faith, and secondly, because they have the holy Word and sacraments. The latter, the Word and the sacraments, must be kept pure because they are the means whereby the Spirit sanctifies its members. "If we wish," Luther says, "to

30 *Ibid.*, p. 68, 27.—Cf. Tapaninen, *op. cit.*, pp. 89 ff., 94 f.

31 WA. 6, 533, 12, *On the Babylonian Captivity*, 1520.

32 WA. 22, 344, 12, 20th Sunday after Trinity, gospel sermon, Cruciger's Summer Postil.

have the Church, it must not be defiled and confused with any satanic doctrine."³³ "For a faulty life does not corrupt Christendom but exercises it; but a faulty doctrine and a false faith corrupts everything. Therefore it must not be suffered; no mercy should be shown it, but it is to be hated and opposed; however, that must be done with the Word of God alone."³⁴

The great fundamental idea in Luther's teaching of the Church is this: The Church is the assembly or communion of those who hear, believe, and confess the true doctrine of the Gospel and have the Holy Spirit. These words imply that the Church is (1) the communion of saints, and that (2) it believes and confesses the true doctrine of the Gospel. Luther never speaks of the true Church as an external ecclesiastical organization that has the orthodox doctrine, as has sometimes been asserted.³⁵

4. CHURCH POLITY AND ORGANIZATION

Luther does not regard ecclesiastical organization superfluous. It is needed for the work of the Gospel in this world, and God is the God of order. All externals, like organization, church buildings, costumes, and other paraphernalia, belong—to use a modern term—to the cultural aspect of the Church, not to its essence, the "supercultural" aspect. The former is changeable and belongs to this world. The latter is abiding and will continue in a glorified form in the life to come. The former has been compared to scaffolding which is necessary when the building work is going on, the latter the actual building which will be left when the scaffolding has been removed.

Luther paid little attention in his writings to the organizational aspect of the Church. The probable reason was that reformation was needed mainly in doctrine and life, and when this took place the organizational changes came about in the natural

33 WA. 50, 173, 6.

34 WA. 17, II, 113, *Church Postil*, 5th Sunday after Epiphany, epistle sermon.

35 Erich Foerster, "Fragen zu Luthers Kirchenbegriff aus der Gedankenwelt seines Alters," *Festgabe für Julius Kaftan* (Tübingen, 1920), pp. 81 ff., avers that in his older age Luther gave up the idea of the Church as the communion of saints and taught that an orthodox external church body is a true Church, Foerster fails to prove his assertion.

course of events. Luther left the matter of organizing the new Evangelical churches to his co-workers. Johann Bugenhagen, the pastor of Wittenberg, seems to have had a special talent at this point. In practice Luther favored the formation of "land churches" (Landeskirchen), national churches to which the entire populations of the various lands belonged. He did not, however, approve of state churches or ecclesiastical bodies governed by temporal rulers and governments. When he asked Evangelical temporal princes (e.g. in his book to the Christian Nobility, 1520) to help in the reformation of the churches of their respective lands, he asked them to do so as "principal members of the Church," not as princes. The dominating position of princes in the Lutheran Churches of various lands, which became almost universal after Luther, cannot be traced back to the teachings and principles of the Reformer. He believed that the Church should be subject to Christ and His Word alone.³⁶

When Luther favored the formation of "land churches" he did it in the hope that this kind of church polity would help to evangelize the entire populations. But he realized that Christians would always make up small minorities, "called out" (ecclesia means people called out) of the world. Therefore he hoped that the Gospel would create within the national churches groups of believers which would be spiritual nuclei of these bodies. He suggested in his Preface to his *German Mass* (*Deutsche Messe*, order of communion service in the German vernacular) in 1526 that two kinds of services be arranged: A liturgical and evangelistic service for the common people, "for there are many among them who do not believe and are not yet Christians" and therefore need a "service that is a public call to faith and Christianity." The other service was to be "for those who desired to be Christians indeed and to profess the Gospel with hand and mouth." Luther, however, made no attempt to organize such devotional meetings of believers.

36 Gustaf Törnvall, *Andligt och världsligt regemente hos Luther* (Spiritual and secular government in Luther's theology), (Stockholm, 1940), pp. 115-128, shows that "the dominating position of the princely power which came about in Lutheranism cannot be traced to Luther.—Luther deals with this question e.g. in his book *Von weltlicher Obrigkeit*, 1523 (WA. 11, 229 ff., Holman ed. III, 228 f.).

The reason was that he did not have, as he thought, enough people for them. He also was afraid of revolt among the "untamed, crude, boisterous folk with whom one ought not to start lightly anything except under the compulsion of a very great need."³⁷ He obviously thought that the thing would take care of itself when real need would appear.

Luther's assumption proved to be right. When the Lutheran Church has had spiritual awakenings such free devotional meetings have sprung up in the natural course of events. Several Lutheran church historians have reminded that this has been a fulfillment of the hopes of Luther, and that there is therefore nothing "un-Lutheran" in them, as has sometimes been thought.³⁸

CONCLUSION

Luther's scriptural teachings of the Church have not always remained alive in Lutheranism, and in our time some Luther students have pointed out that a return to Luther, and through him to the Bible, is needed here, too. Paul Althaus says that Luther's view of the Church as the communion of saints has been forgotten in large circles of Lutherans, and that it has had no decisive influence on its doctrinal development.³⁹ Karl Holl has remarked that this idea of Luther has almost entirely disappeared from Protestantism.⁴⁰ Their generalizations do not, however, apply to all Lutherans or Protestants. In the Lutheran and Protestant revival movements the Church has always been regarded as the communion of saints, and so it has been in general in Lutheran catechisms and a large proportion of Lutheran dogmatic theology. But in practical church life this scriptural concept of the Church has too often been left on the bookshelves, to be mere theoretical doctrine.

37 WA. 19, 44 f.

38 See e.g. G. Hilbert, *Ecclesiola in ecclesia* (Leipzig, 1920), Th. Knolle, "Luthers Deutsche Messe und die Rechtfertigungslehre," *Luther-Jahrbuch*, 1928. L. P. Tapaninen, *Lutherin kirkkonäkemys* (Luther's concept of the Church), (Kemi, 1942), pp. 99-106, Aulén, *op. cit.*, pp. 38 ff., Tapaninen, *op. cit.*, pp. 67 f., 99 ff.

39 Althaus, *Communio sanctorum*, p. 23.

40 Holl, *Deutsch-Evangelisch*, 1917, p. 245.

Luther and Gregory of Rimini

ROBERT SPIELER

KARL STANGE, writing in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*,¹ claims that Luther was much influenced in his theology by a certain Gregory of Rimini. This is a provocative assertion, and one which challenges us to examine the relationship which may have existed between Luther and Gregory. Our method of inquiry will be to first define the position of Gregory, and then to determine to what extent and in what matters Luther may have been influenced by him.

It is to be lamented that the irony of history has relegated Gregory of Rimini into the realm of the unknown.² Even the best available sources have only a precious little to say about the life and work of this colorful but controversial Scholastic. Nevertheless, certain skeleton facts may be gleaned from them.

Gregory Novelli of Rimini was an Italian by birth. He matriculated at the University of Paris in 1324, at the very time when that school was permeated with the atmosphere of Occamistic nominalism. Upon his graduation he entered the Order of the Augustinian Eremites, but instead of being committed to the cloister, he was sent forth to teach in his native Italy. Some time later he returned to Paris and there became a Doctor of Theology in 1345.

The next period of Gregory's career was one of almost spectacular success. He must have been exceptionally capable, for the amount of work he produced is truly impressive. The very fact that, among other subjects, he taught so important a course as the Sentences of Peter Lombard at the University of Paris, perhaps

1 Karl Stange, "Ueber Luthers Beziehungen zur Theologie seines Ordens," *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (1900), pp. 574-585.

2 The recent definitive work on Luther by E. G. Schwiebert (*Luther in His Times*) makes no mention of Gregory of Rimini; neither does Bainton's *Here I Stand*.

the foremost center of learning in that period, gives indication of his pedagogical brilliance. And, as though that were not enough, he also busied himself with producing written works. These were great in number, and ranged in variety from commentaries on biblical books to philosophical treatises. Unfortunately, however, almost none of Gregory's works were ever reproduced. He wrote a monumental treatise on the Sentences, but of this only the first two volumes seem to have been printed, and these are extant only in a very rare edition. His influence nevertheless spread, until in 1357 he rose to the highest position among the Augustinians, that of General of the Order, an office which he occupied with distinction until his death at Vienna in the following year.³

Gregory's theological position was unique for his time. To fully understand the nature and value of his system, it will be necessary first to describe the official theology of the Augustinians and then to contrast this with his.

As is well known, the Augustinian Eremites had deserted the theology of St. Augustine long before the day of Gregory. They had virtually nothing in common with the Bishop of Hippo except his name and the fact that they followed his rule as a basis for their monastic constitution.⁴ Their chief claim to fame lay not in their religious thought but rather in their emphasis on what was considered pious living. No monks of late medievalism were such devoted servants of the Virgin Mother and of the Papacy as were these Augustinians;⁵ yet on the other hand, no Order contributed less to the trends of Scholasticism.⁶

The Order was finally rescued from theological sterility by the labors of Aegidius Romanus, one of its members. Aegidius, who died in 1316 (thus preceding the activity of Gregory by at least half a century), provided the Augustinians with a system

3 Maurice DeWulf, *A History of Mediaeval Philosophy*. II. Translated by E. C. Messenger (New York: Longman, Green and Co., 1926), p. 195.

4 Thomas Lindsay, *History of the Reformation* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931), p. 138.

5 *Ibid.*

6 *Ibid.*

which was to become official and normative for them. Karl Werner, the German Catholic historian, roundly affirms that Aegidius was an interpreter of "spezifischen Augustinismus" amongst the medieval Scholastics.⁷ With this Reinhold Seeberg disagrees. He restricts this "specific Augustinianism" to the philosophy and not to the theology of Aegidius. As for his theology, that "generally aligned itself with Thomas Aquinas," says Seeberg. These affinities with Thomism are especially apparent in the Aegidian views of sin and grace, which were virtually identical with the then currently popular Semi-Pelagianism of Aquinas. Small wonder therefore that in 1287 the theology of Aegidius was declared the official "Ordens-theologie" for the Augustinian Eremites. Stange presents the following critique of Aegidianism:

The so-called *Schola Aegidiana*, i.e., the official theology of the Augustinian Hermits, is essentially a reaction of Augustine's Platonism against medieval Aristotelianism and an attempt to modify Thomism with the Platonism of Augustine. The *Schola Aegidiana* is therefore merely a degenerate offshoot from Thomism.⁹

Aegidianism enjoyed a brief popularity and for a time influenced the universities, including even that of Paris.¹⁰ A new tendency, however, was soon to challenge the *Schola Aegidiana*. This was the movement spearheaded by Gregory of Rimini.

The uniqueness of Gregory's position lies in the fact that, while on the one hand he opposed every major school of his day, he nevertheless on the other effected a successful synthesis of Occamistic terminism with the Augustinian teachings of sin and grace. Gregory was strongly influenced by the nominalism of his contemporary Occam, and began his movement by sharply criticizing the realism of the Thomistically orientated Aegidians. In-

7 Stange, *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, p. 578.

8 Reinhold Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*. III (Leipzig: Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Werner Scholl, 1917), p. 621.

9 Stange, *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, p. 579.

10 *Ibid.*, p. 580.

terestingly enough, both he and his opponents relied upon Augustine as an authority, yet in a widely differing manner:

The Augustinianism of Aegidius is related to the speculative tendencies of Thomism, but the Augustinianism of Gregory leads to an anti-speculative empiricism, after the manner of Scotus and Occam, and to the sharpest polemic against the speculative tendencies of Thomism.¹¹

It should be carefully noted, however, that it was Augustine, and not Occam, who eventually emerged as the final authority for Gregory's philosophical position. Entire pages of his manuscripts are said to be literally filled with citations from the great Father, and wherever Augustine disagreed with Occam, there Gregory sided with him.

Augustine was even more normative for Gregory in the field of theology. Gregory, much like any other scholastic, of course treasured the Scriptures as the final authority for doctrine; yet these, he felt, were nowhere interpreted so validly as by Augustine. In fact, Gregory all but identified his position with that of Augustine. He for example recognized Pelagianism as the "Grundhärese" in much the same manner as his master once had.¹² This cancer he detected in virtually all the doctrinal systems of his day, and so he warned and corrected and opposed the errorists about him.

Much of his theology thus contrasted sharply with the teachings of his contemporaries. Gregory is especially distinctive for his clear enunciation of the damning nature and effect of original sin. The Pelagianists, he insisted, had failed to grasp the truth that the natural man is totally depraved before God.¹³ Original sin is much more than a slight defect of human nature or a mere suspension of human capacity. Against such erroneous views, Gregory asserted: "Concupiscence itself is original sin" (*Ipsam concupiscentiam esse originale peccatum*).¹⁴ And to prevent any

11 *Ibid.*

12 Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte*, III, p. 648.

13 *Ibid.*

14 Reinhold Seeberg, *Realencyklopaedie fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche*. Edited by A. Hauck (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1904), XVII, 726.

possible misunderstanding of his position, he further explained that the concupiscence of original sin was not to be confused with the act of concupiscence; it rather refers to carnality (*carnalitas*), which is hereditary, and a real quality (*realis qualitas*) in the soul of man.¹⁵ With these watchwords, Gregory openly broke from the Scotistic tradition and allied himself with Augustine.

Gregory next proceeded to define the effects of original sin. From his basic premise that the essence of original sin is concupiscence, he argued that all mankind is entirely lost and condemned through the vice of origin.¹⁶ Infants who die without baptism will therefore experience the punishment of the damned. It took courage to claim this in his day, but it took even more courage to teach, as he did, that the Virgin Mary must of necessity have been under the penalty of sin. Should anyone doubt these facts, then let him know that human works, "though they seem virtuous and laudable, are nevertheless sins and are to be punished."¹⁷

In his concept of grace, Gregory was again quite true to Augustine. He followed his master, for example, in saying that grace does not depend upon anything in man's nature or activity. Rather,

Without the special help of God, man cannot do moral works. . . . Every time we do good works, it is God who acts in us and with us.¹⁸

It should be stated at this point that Gregory denies that the natural man is free. He may seem so in his daily psychological and moral activities, but actually he is in the bondage of sin. And especially in soteriological matters, the freedom of man is a phantasy. Man simply can never initiate any activity which leads to salvation. Gregory's contemporaries believed that the natural man can win divine favor *de congruo* (when God is forced to reward the good work of an unbeliever in a measure commensurate with

15 Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 649.

16 *Ibid.*

17 *Ibid.*

18 Friedrich Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte* (Halle: Verlag von Max Niemeyer, 1906), p. 616.

its value) and that the believer can coerce God *de condigno* (when God is forced to reward the believer's cooperation with infused grace by granting him the merits of Christ). These distinctions are travesties of Scriptural truth for Gregory.¹⁹ In all areas of life, the initiative of any positive activity is always with God.

Gregory was nevertheless still enough of a Scholastic to toy with the idea of infused grace, for he wrote that God pours out His grace into man's soul as a gift.²⁰ This *gratia infusa* must however be distinguished from saving grace in Gregory's system, for he did not mean to indicate that it was operative in the realm of soteriology. Infused grace is rather that general divine influence which makes civil morality possible. "The essential point in Gregory's teaching," writes Seeberg, "lies in his sharp differentiation between the general influence of God upon man and the *specialis assistentia* of grace."²¹

Augustine's views of predestination also found a ready acceptance with this pupil of his. "Predestination," Gregory said, "is the proposal to grant eternal life; reprobation, the proposal not to grant it."²² Moreover, God's will in predestination is irresistible and cannot be frustrated by the obstinacy of man.²³ Gregory logically enough used this concept of election to militate against the Pelagians. He reasoned that if God is the cause of predestination, and if salvation is due to predestination, then there can be no cause for salvation in man.

An analysis of Gregory's theology uncovers two major emphases: first, he insists that man is sinful to the utmost and thus has no true freedom; secondly, God alone is the cause of good, and especially of salvation.²⁴

With these emphases, Gregory virtually threw a bombshell into the playground of Scholasticism and for a brief moment appeared to have gained the victory. His success as a lecturer and

19 Seeberg, *Realencyklopaedie*, p. 127.

20 Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 650.

21 *Ibid.*

22 Loofs, *op. cit.*, p. 616.

23 Seeberg, *Realencyklopaedie*, XVII, 726.

24 Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte*, III, 651.

his leadership in his Order certainly indicate his popularity. In fact, he exerted such an influence over his co-workers that they ascribed the name *Doctor Authenticus* to him, thereby meaning to indicate that of all the teachers who claimed Augustine as authority, Gregory of Rimini alone was his authentic interpreter.²⁵

The prevailing Pelagianism of that time was however not to be so easily undone. The Augustinian Order never officially recognized the theology of this brilliant son of hers, and France even banned his views in 1474. Later Catholicism wrote him off as unorthodox and inconsequential. Denifle says of Gregory, "Actually, his work is a bungled mess (Pfuscherei). Here Occamism appears in the foreground; there Augustinianism, its contradiction."²⁶

Yet Gregory was not forgotten. In France, strong protest caused the ill-conceived ban of his theology to be lifted in 1481, two years before Luther's birth.²⁷ Germany gave an even more sympathetic ear to him. There Augustine had found haven; and so there quite naturally this disciple of his also was heard.²⁸

We turn now to the fascinating question of Luther's relationship to Gregory of Rimini. One cannot escape the facts that Luther not only knew Gregory's system well, but that he also accorded him special honor. Otherwise, why should he have named Gregory "meinen lieben Meister,"²⁹ or have claimed that he was "without doubt the chief and most ingenious of the Scholastics"³⁰ had he not been impressed and in sympathy with his system?

It is virtually impossible to determine precisely when or how Luther came to know the theology of Gregory. At best, one may conjecture that this occurred at Erfurt, perhaps both in the University and the Augustinian Monastery there. Luther himself re-

25 Stange, *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, p. 581.

26 Loofs, *op. cit.*, p. 617.

27 DeWulf, *op. cit.*, p. 288.

28 Luther reported that Gregory of Rimini was taught in all the universities, presumably in Germany. Cf. Stange, *Studien zur Theologie Luthers* (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1928), p. 15.

29 Seeberg, *Realencyklopaedie*, XIV, 279.

30 *Ibid.*

ported that Gregory of Rimini was taught in all the universities. This seems to have been especially true of the schools under Augustinian influence, as was the case at Erfurt.³¹ We are certain that the *via moderna*, which Gregory had favored in at least some of his philosophical predilections, was in vogue at Erfurt at the time of Luther's matriculation there, and thus this may have been the vehicle for introducing Gregory to Luther.

The theological atmosphere of the Augustinian Eremite Monastery in Erfurt gave an even better opportunity for Luther to learn of Gregory. We can scarcely conceive of a single theological environment where there was such an interplay of differing influences as that afforded by Genser, Nathin, and Staupitz, here in the Black Monastery. John Genser favored the strictest form of papal absolutism;³² John Nathin, that thorough taskmaster, considered himself a true disciple of Occam and thus did not stand completely with Genser;³³ John von Staupitz was essentially a Thomist with a strong inclination toward Mysticism and a disregard of papal supremacy,³⁴ which of course meant that his views were actually in substantial disagreement with those of Genser and Nathin.

Now, in the midst of such a confused conglomeration of theological cross-currents, could Luther have become acquainted with Gregory of Rimini? The evidence certainly strongly favors that possibility. The official Aegidian "Ardenstheologie" was apparently in disuse at the Black Monastery in Luther's day, and so there may have been ample opportunity to hear Gregory's theology here instead. Stange even claims that Luther was a member of a clandestine Rimini-Party in the Monastery.³⁵ This however cannot be substantiated.

What is definitely factual is that Luther had become well acquainted with Gregory sometime before his actual reformatory

31 Stange, *Studien*, p. 15.

32 Lindsay, *op. cit.*, p. 199.

33 *Ibid.*, p. 200.

34 Heinrich Boehmer, *Road to Reformation*. Translated by Doberstein and Tappert (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1946), p. 104.

35 Stange, *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, p. 582.

activities began. The earliest indication of this is at the Leipzig Debate of 1519, where Luther depended upon Gregory as one of the weapons in his arsenal.³⁶ Gregory is mentioned five times by Luther in the *Acts* of the debate and three times in the *Resolutions*.³⁷ The nature of these numerous references is well indicated by the following, taken from Luther's preface in the resolutions for the debate:

It is evident that some Modernists (so-called) are agreed with the Scotists and the Thomists in certain matters (that is, in the questions of the freedom of the will and of grace), with the exception of Gregory of Rimini, whom they all condemn, but who convinced them that they are even worse than the Pelagianists. In contrast to all other Scholastics, he is the only one to agree with Augustine and the Apostle Paul.³⁸

The data from the Leipzig Debate thus proves that Luther regarded Gregory's theology with high esteem. When his antagonist Eck brusquely ruled Gregory out as an authority, Luther responded that Gregory "agrees with Augustine and the Holy Scriptures, certainly opposing all the Scholastics and especially Aristotle, but refuted by none of them."³⁹

This same glowing estimate of Gregory is also apparent in some of Luther's primary writings. For example, he prepared a special introduction for Augustine's book, *De Spiritu et Litera*, where he emphatically declared that all the Scholastics, with the sole exception of Gregory of Rimini, had misinterpreted Augustine:

... from them, there came a quite satanical voice . . . (But) there is one, this Gregory of Rimini, who dares hold forth Augustine and do battle against the Sophists . . . ; however, he did not succeed, because the theologians of the Sorbonne minimized him and asserted that too much had already been spoken about Augustine.⁴⁰

36 *Ibid.*, p. 583.

37 Stange, *Studien*, p. 14.

38 Stange, *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, p. 583.

39 Stange, *Studien*, p. 15.

40 *Ibid.*

Even Luther's enemies are willing to concede his affinity with Gregory. There is that most interesting reference in a work by Hieronymous von Dungersheim, where this Papist complains that Luther had accused all the Schoolmen of heresy—"with the sole exception of Gregory of Rimini, who he claims was correct in regard to grace."⁴¹

But just how much did Gregory of Rimini influence Luther's theology? There are certain obvious similarities between the two. The very attitude, for example, with which Luther approached religion was much the same as that which had been held by Gregory. Both regarded theology more from an existentialistic, than from an essentialistic, viewpoint. The Thomists treated theology as a study of propositions which could be rationally isolated and defined. Theology for them was a normative science, in which man, the knowing subject, dealt with God as though He were a known object, an *entia*. Gregory, on the other hand, viewed theology as a matter of concrete concern,⁴² and thus felt that it ought to busy itself with describing God's involvement with man. Luther occupies much the same position in this matter; yet one dare not conclusively say that it was Gregory who led him there.

In Luther's early views regarding original sin, free will, and predestination, his affinities with Gregory are more observable. Seeberg says outright that it was Gregory who made Luther really to understand that concupiscence is the essence of original sin.⁴³ And in describing the effects of sin, Luther again moved in the tradition of Gregory. This was noticeable already at the Leipzig Debate, where Luther sided with Gregory in saying that everything which is done by man is either good or evil.⁴⁴ Here really is an exceptionally normative influence of Gregory upon Luther, for this thought—that there is no amorality among men, that every deed is either good or evil, and that therefore the judgment of an act

41 Stange, *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, p. 583. Denifle, a modern Romanist, also admits that Gregory influenced Luther's theology, but claims Gregory misled Luther. Cf. A. V. Mueller, *Luthers Theologische Quellen*. (Gieszen: Toepelmann, 1912), p. 190.

42 Seeberg, *Realencyklopaedie*, XVII, 726.

43 Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte*, IV, 85.

44 Stange, *Studien*, p. 14.

cannot be separated from the judgment of the actor—is a viewpoint which Luther often emphasized.

From his Augustinian view of the nature and effect of original sin, Gregory had been led to deny the freedom of the will. Luther seems to have followed him also in this important teaching. He insists that the entire nature of man is affected by concupiscence. If this be so, then the natural man is far from free; he is rather ensnared and imprisoned by concupiscence, even though he appears to express himself in psychologically free acts. Luther "with Gregory of Rimini accuses as Pelagianistic any teaching which denies this."⁴⁵

It will be remembered that Gregory had taught an absolute double predestination, following in this the basic view of his master, Augustine, but appending to it a rather severe determinism. Everything, he had said, is determined by God and therefore nothing can frustrate God's sovereign will.⁴⁶ Could this have been Luther's view at one time? Friedrich Loofs answers with a qualified affirmation. "Perhaps it is possible," he thinks, "that Gregory of Rimini . . . influenced Luther at this point."⁴⁷ It is true that the young Luther held a more terrifying view in this area than is usually suspected.

Normative though Gregory may have been for the Reformer at one time, it should be carefully noted that Luther later departed from him at several salient points. Reinhold Seeberg tells us that Luther eventually superseded Gregory's teaching of concupiscence by recognizing it as a spiritual and not a mere intellectual drive.⁴⁸ So also with reference to the doctrine of grace, Luther out-grew Gregory. Gregory had of course admitted that saving grace is monergistic and unmerited, but he never quite succeeded in viewing grace as the *favor Dei propter Christum*, as Luther did so vividly. And of course, the older Luther parted ways with Gregory also in his teaching of predestination. It is significant that the

45 Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte*, IV, 89.

46 Loofs, *op. cit.*, p. 756.

47 *Ibid.*

48 Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte*, IV, 85.

later writings of the Reformer never again mention Gregory of Rimini by name.

This simple fact, however, cannot be evaded: Luther did at one time speak of Gregory in terms of sympathetic understanding and sincere admiration. We conclude therefore that Gregory did influence Luther, but primarily in an indirect manner. He helped blaze the trail for Luther back through Augustine to Paul. There is something fascinating about the relationship of this obscure *Doctor Authenticus* to the well-known Luther. Gregory of Rimini was in truth a forerunner of the Reformation, and because of this very fact he still merits our attention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boehmer, Heinrich. *Road to Reformation*. Translated from the German by John Doberstein and Theodore Tappert. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1946.
- DeWulf, Maurice. *A History of Mediaeval Philosophy*. Translated by E. C. Messenger. II. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1926.
- Koch, J. "Gregor von Rimini," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Edited by Alfred Bertholet. II. Tuebingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, 1928.
- Lindsay, Thomas M. *A History of the Reformation*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931.
- Loofs, Friedrich. *Leitfaden der Dogmengeschichte*. Halle: Verlag von Max Meiner, 1906.
- Mueller, Alphons. *Luthers Theologische Quellen*. Gieszen: Verlag von Alfred Toepelmann, 1912.
- Seeberg, Reinhold. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*. III and IV. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913.
- . "Gregor von Rimini," *Realencyklopaedie fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche*. Edited by Albert Hauck. XIV and XVII. Leipzig: J. C. Hinricks'sche Buchhandlung, 1904.
- Stange, Karl. *Studien zur Theologie Luthers*. Guetersloh: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1928.
- . "Ueber Luthers Beziehungen zur Theologie seiner Ordens," *Neue Kirchlich Zeitschrift* (1900), pp. 574-585.

Grundtvig Research

J. KNUDSEN

MARTIN LUTHER and N. F. S. Grundtvig were born in the same year of their respective centuries, 1483 and 1783. There are many other parallels in their history, but there is one outstanding difference. Luther died in 1546 at the age of 62; Grundtvig lived to be 89 and he was active until his death in 1872. This means that Grundtvig was still living and was an active participant when the movement, which grew out of his influence and inspiration, settled down to "official" or "semi-official" points of view. In one sense he was blessedly free from doctrinalization. There were no creedal statements made during his lifetime nor a formula of concord a generation after his death. Although he suffered much opposition he lived within a church which eventually accepted his contribution. Today his influence has become an integral part of Danish church life to an extent of which one only becomes aware by comparing the present church in Denmark with Lutheran churches of other lands, even the sister Scandinavian countries.

On the other hand, Grundtvig was constantly giving strong expression to his ideas. His nature was such that he always pitted his insights against opposing viewpoints in polemical expression, and as a result he pointed up his own views so much that they were often given a doctrinal character. He was always ready to reconsider and revise his opinions in changing conditions, but when he became the center of a movement this revision was not so easy. His followers gave static expression to his ideas which he, in his later years, was prone to accept to the extent that a dogmatization took place. This static expression was seized by his opponents as well as by his followers, and as a result he is often misunderstood today.

The most important example of this misunderstanding is found in regard to his views of the Bible and the creed. There are many who sum up Grundtvig's contribution in the statement that

he replaced the literal significance of the Bible with the literal significance of the creed and that he taught that the creed was dictated by Jesus in the forty days between the resurrection and the ascension. That the followers of Grundtvig, and even he himself, are to blame for this understanding there can be no doubt, but he certainly deserves to be liberated from the misconception. A complete liberation would naturally involve a thorough analysis of how his basic viewpoints were twisted into this misleading simplification, but an indication can be given.

Grundtvig's concern through many years of deliberation was to find evidence of the effectiveness of the Christian revelation in history. He believed that the revelation in Christ was continuously operative through the Christian church but he looked for "evidence" of its effectiveness. Part of the answer he found in the church's response in its confession of Christ as Lord and Savior. For this reason he stressed the confession of the Triune God, and he claimed that this confession, which was inseparably connected with the sacraments, must be the same today as it has been through history. At first, and for many years, this "unchangeable" character of the confession was applied only to the content of the confession, but under the influence of men and situations he, in later years, applied it also to the form of the Apostolic Creed, thereby moving onto insecure historical ground and jeopardizing the basic character of his original contention. As a result he has been criticized and even ridiculed, but it is characteristic that his countrymen and the other Scandinavians no longer judge him by this doctrinalization, and it is time that the misunderstanding be dispelled in other circles. Toward this end the modern Grundtvig scholarship has made valuable contribution.

The Grundtvigian movement was a strong religious and national revival movement. From the 1830's until Grundtvig's death, and even after his death, new fruits were constantly appearing in the "free" church groups, the folk schools, etc. Toward the end of the century a rather definite pattern of "Grundtvigianism" had been established, however. This pattern was formed by the application of Grundtvig's ideas, and in some respects it was a true

reflection of the original dynamics, while in other respects it was an adapted version which had created what historians now call the "Grundtvigian milieu." Out of this pattern arose the first interpretation of Grundtvig, and while its merits must not be undervalued, we must be historically aware of the fact that this interpretation was largely limited to the expression which Grundtvig's ideas had found in a specific situation, his own national and religious environment.

The first wave of Grundtvig scholarship came a decade after his death. In 1880 his son, Svend Grundtvig, edited a ten volume selection of *Poetical Works* (not including hymns). In 1882 Grundtvig's and Ingemann's letters were published and the same year V. Brun presented a *Life of Grundtvig*. This was followed in 1883 by Winkel Horn's biography and Ludvig Schrøder's *Grundtvig's Childhood and Early Youth*. Schrøder was director of the largest of the folk schools, and his erudition earned him the popular title of "Doctor of Grundtvig." He published a complete biography in 1901. Around the turn of the century Holger Begtrup initiated his long and valuable Grundtvig research with four monographs published in 1899, 1900, 1901, and 1905, and in 1904-1909 he edited the *Selected Works of Grundtvig* in ten thick volumes. Begtrup found and used considerable unpublished material and he deserves great credit for his penetrating work. Later scholarship has found that he did not dig deeply enough and that he established even more firmly the traditional concept of Grundtvig, but it must be remembered that he was doing pioneering work and his efforts should be highly appreciated.

F. Rønning contributed the largest biography of Grundtvig when he published four volumes, 1907-1914. He collected a great deal of material and his book is a veritable, and interesting, source collection, but he was not discriminating enough and many of his judgments are superficial. For many years it was *the* handbook in the life of Grundtvig, and it is very useful even today; but it was too bulky, so in 1909 and 1917 H. Rosendahl and Th. Bredsdorff respectively issued smaller and popular but excellent biographies.

In 1918 Professor Hjalmar Helweg started a new type of investigation with a psychoanalysis of Grundtvig in which he claimed that his subject suffered from a manic-depressive psychosis in several periods of his life. This contention set off a great discussion, and there can be no doubt that Helweg made many correct observations, but it is felt today that he jumped to many of his conclusions and that he greatly overstated the case. J. P. Bang, professor of systematics at Copenhagen University, continued the analytical trend by *The Heritage of Grundtvig* in 1925 in which he examined in an appreciative way the component parts of Grundtvig's tremendous contribution. Bang's book grew from within the milieu, however, as did the very useful *Handbook in Grundtvig's Writings*, I-III, which was published by Frederik Schrøder and Ernst Borup 1929-31. In 1924 a valuable two-volume edition of Grundtvig's letters was added to the available sources.

As a harbinger of a new approach Professor Edv. Lehmann wrote a new biography which was printed in 1929. It attempted to evaluate Grundtvig in relation to contemporary movements, especially Romanticism. Lehmann was a philosopher and a brilliant writer who interpreted Grundtvig "religionsgeschichtlich," and his effort deserves acclaim even though later research has proved it to be onesided and somewhat superficial. In many ways Lehmann's intuition was correct. Even more intuitive, however, and placing Grundtvig in the setting of centuries, was Vilh. Grønbech's famous essay about "Kierkegaard and Grundtvig" in 1930. Grønbech, a poetic and sensitive soul, was perhaps the greatest religious personality of the twentieth century in Denmark. He taught the history of religions at the University of Copenhagen, and although he was rather far from the orthodox Christian views, his strangely persuasive voice was heard far and wide. When he called attention to the creative genius of Grundtvig, the monumentality of the prophet was seen like a mountain rising above the fog.

Grundtvigianism still had two significant contributions to make from its classical tradition, however. In his old age Holger Begtrup added to his earlier studies of the young Grundtvig an analysis of his later years, *Grundtvig's Danske Kristendom*, I-II,

1935. It was a scholarly and well documented study with several valuable and original contributions, but it lacked the freshness of approach which was now needed. He was joined by Anders Nørgaard who rose in indignant wrath from the Grundtvigian congregation to strike at the humanizing tendencies of the late decades and to reassert the fundamental Christian centrality and the sacramental emphasis of the prophet. There was a terrible magnificence about Norgaard which reflected the revivalistic power of the Grundtvigian movement, but there was also a tragic and retrospective orthodoxy about his three volume history of the movement, *Grundtvigianismen*, I-III, 1935-38.

In the 1940's a new scholarship was to be begun and to gain momentum. Professor Poul Andersen issued his excellent study, *Grundtvig as a Member of Parliament*, in 1940, but the important event of the year was Professor Hal Koch's lecture series on Grundtvig at the university. It was the first year of the German occupation and there was a need for national inspiration which the lectures seemed to fill. Grundtvig had the word to say to his people in a time of distress, and great numbers flocked to hear the young professor. The lectures were subsequently published, first in Sweden, later in Denmark, Germany, and France, and in 1952 in America. They reflect the greatness of the message of Grundtvig, particularly as it spoke to the people in a time of need. Their shortcoming is that they were prepared and published before the research of the past decade was available. To this research Hal Koch, who is an eminent church historian with an unusual ability to ferret out the essentials of historical development, has made valuable contributions.

Also published during the war was Johan Borup's poetic and personal biography. It is perhaps the finest interpretation which rose out of a personal commitment to Grundtvig's leadership and it might well be the final contribution from this point of view. For after the war a new and remarkable type of Grundtvig research emerged which can, in many ways, be compared to the Luther scholarship of recent years. It is recruited in part from the old Grundtvigian movement whose younger representatives

are eager for revaluations, in part from the Grundtvig enthusiasm of the war years, and in part from an academic interest in a great national, religious, and literary figure. Its instrument is the "Grundtvig Society of 1947" which sponsors research and publishes an annual book of Grundtvig studies. This yearbook contains English summaries of all articles and it should warrant the attention of American libraries and scholars. The society is the natural channel for all interest in Grundtvig.¹

The first monograph of this recent research was contributed by an elder scholar, Bishop C. I. Scharling, who has since passed away. He took up the task begun by Lehmann eighteen years earlier and analyzed Grundtvig's relation to Romanticism, especially to the philosopher Schelling, in "Grundtvig og Romantiken," 1947. An approach had been made by Povl Engberg to the same subject in 1940 in a study of Romanticism and the Danish Folk Schools, but Scharling's study is by far the more penetrating. Scharling also contributed an article in Grundtvig Studies of 1950 about Grundtvig's eschatology.

In 1948 Steen Johansen and Henning Høirup issued a source book, *Grundtvig's Recollections and Recollections About Grundtvig*, and in 1949 Høirup submitted the first doctoral dissertation about Grundtvig which was accepted by a Danish university. His thesis was an analysis of Grundtvig's epistemology: "Grundtvig's Syn paa Tro og Erkendelse," and he demonstrated how Grundtvig used the epistemology of Christian Wolff, particularly the so-called Principle of Contradiction, in his argumentation. In so doing he penetrated more deeply into the early source material and even into some of Grundtvig's basic ideas than had previously been the case, and he showed how Grundtvig, contrary to an accepted opinion, had been a philosopher of no mean quality. He brought to light considerable unpublished material and called attention to unnoticed writings which showed the evolution of Grundtvig's early ideas. His book is a very important milestone in Grundtvig research.

1 Its address is: Grundtvig Selskabet, Vartov, Copenhagen, Denmark, and membership dues are \$1.25 a year.

Close upon Høirup's followed another very learned dissertation by Helge Toldberg, "Grundtvig's Symbolverden" 1950, which analyzed Grundtvig's literary and religious symbols and terminology from the point of view of literary science and particularly the approach of a literary school at the university. Toldberg had previously written about Grundtvig's relation to the British antiquarians in a study in *Orbis Literarum*, Tome V, Fasc. 3-4, 1947, a study which contains an English summary.

A young American-born scholar, Magnus Stevns, showed great promise in Grundtvig research, but his contribution was cut short by his untimely death in 1949. His field was the analysis of Grundtvig's hymns, and his essays were published by the Grundtvig Society in 1950 under the title "From Grundtvig's Hymnal Workshop." Vilh. Grønbaek, who is not to be confused with the above-mentioned Vilh. Grønbech, issued "Grundtvig's Psychological Ideas," 1951, and Erik Møller published "Grundtvig as a Contemporary Historian." None of these is translated to English. Quite a number of monographs have been published in the Grundtvig Studies and several scholars are working on dissertations which will be ready in the near future, particularly William Michelsen and Kaj Thaning. Steen Johansen has done yeoman service with bibliography and has published a monumental three-volume *Grundtvig Bibliography*, 1950-51, with an almost unbelievably detailed account of Grundtvig's writings. He is also compiling annual bibliographical lists for the Grundtvig Society.

The latest book about Grundtvig was published in English. It is *Grundtvig, an Introduction*, S.P.C.K., 1951, by Professor P. G. Lindhart of Aarhus University. Lindhardt had previously discussed the Grundtvigian movement in his book about revivals and church movements in Denmark in the nineteenth century. With fine skill he had contributed a materialistic interpretation to an overspiritualized subject. In his Grundtvig book he stressed the relation of Grundtvig to England, calling attention especially to the influence from the Coleridgian circle. He writes with a brilliant but almost cold-blooded dissection of the past.

We have already mentioned that Professor Hal Koch has con-

tributed several valuable monographs to the current Grundtvig studies and should add that Professor Regin Prenter of Aarhus University has done the same. Prenter has made valuable use of Grundtvig in his latest volume of essays, *Ordet og Aanden*, 1952, and his recently published *Dogmatics* contains a penetrating analysis of Grundtvig's anthropology.

The work of editing and publishing Grundtvig's writings has also progressed. From 1940 to 1949 Hal Koch and Georg Christensen were editors of a new selection, *Vaerker i Udvalg*, I-X, with excellent introductions to each volume. Six of the volumes contain prose selections, two contain poetry, and two contain hymns. Incidentally, the commentary and interpretation of Grundtvig's hymns are legion and even the briefest of comment would be impossible in an article such as this. It should be mentioned, however, that Grundtvig's great hymn production, gathered in *Sangvaerk til den Danske Kirke*, is being re-edited and republished by a committee. So far five volumes have been issued.

Up to the publication of the translation of Hal Koch's biography in 1952 the English material about Grundtvig was very limited. A German study of the folk schools by Holmann and several translations of Danish folk school studies, plus several English and American folk school analyses contain chapters about Grundtvig, but all of these emphasize only the educational angle. Noëlle Davis in England has published a short biography and analysis, *Grundtvig of Denmark*. A number of American scholars have written dissertations about Grundtvig, the latest of these being Ernest D. Nielson's, but to my knowledge none of these has been published at the present time. Kemp Malone has given us three valuable monographs: "Grundtvig's Philosophy of History" in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 1940, Vol. 1, No. 3; "Grundtvig as a Beowulf Critic," *The Review of English Studies*, 1941, Vol. XVII; and "Grundtvig on Paradise Lost," *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hardin Craig*, 1941.

It will be seen that the Grundtvig research and scholarship is impressive and this again is a tribute to the pertinency and relevance of Grundtvig's ideas.

Scientific Secularism and the Christian Religion

BRYCE SHOEMAKER

TWENTIETH century man is faced with two conflicting ideologies that both claim to be the true "way of life"—scientific secularism and the Christian religion. The arena of the conflict between them is not, however, clearly defined, for Christians condemn secularists and secularists condemn Christians without either even attempting to understand the positions of the others or the issues at stake. In this article no attempt is made to solve the conflict because the issues cannot be easily solved by assertions. Rather, the article is an attempt to clarify the issues and point up the questions. Some, no doubt, will feel that the answer is a simple one. But others may see the gravity of the situation. It is to be hoped that all will consider honestly their effectiveness as prophets in this ideological controversy.

I. THE SCOPE OF THE CONFLICT

The scope of the conflict between the religious and scientific outlooks can be rightly understood only when it is viewed in historical perspective. The discoveries of science in the past decade only bring out more vividly the importance of the turn which the world took in the scientific revolution which had its beginnings in the seventeenth century. Our Graeco-Roman roots and our Christian heritage have been so central to our thinking that it has required centuries of pulls and pressures to make it clear that the center has shifted.

We know now that what was emerging towards the end of the seventeenth century was a civilization exhilaratingly new perhaps, but strange as

Nineveh and Babylon. That is why, since the rise of Christianity, there is no landmark in history that is worthy to be compared with this.¹

It can hardly be doubted that the religious mind has not yet fully related itself to all that is involved in the rise of modern science. There exist side by side two different ways of thought, two different approaches to questions, two different languages, between which mutual understanding is difficult. The fundamental issue which confronts mankind in the present historical situation is whether the scientific understanding of the world has destroyed the roots of religious faith and hope.

In accepting the contrast and conflict between the religious and scientific views of the world certain important distinctions have to be kept clearly in mind. Science has to be distinguished, in the first place, from technology, with which it is constantly confused. Science is the search for a deeper understanding of the relations between natural phenomena; technology is the use of any knowledge about natural phenomena for attaining practical ends. Technology is much older than science. Invention has proceeded independently of scientific discovery. It is the discovery of the power of scientific knowledge to extend enormously the scope of technological advance that has created the new scientific and technological era in which we are living.

A second distinction which needs to be kept in view is the difference between science itself and a fundamental attitude to life which finds its primary interest in those aspects of experience which science seeks to explore and in the satisfactions which scientific discovery is able to provide. The main preoccupation of western man in recent centuries has been the discovery and transformation of the world, and science and technology have been the means of furthering this interest. This absorption in the mastery of the external environment has fostered the growth of a secular view of life. This view of life is interested in science primarily because of its contribution to temporal well-being. To large numbers of people science means the provision of aids to comfortable living

1 Butterfield, Herbert. *Origins of Modern Science*, p. 174.

and the multiplication of gadgets which minister to ease and enjoyment.

The debate between the religious and scientific views of the world is no longer concerned with the freedom of science to investigate everything that can be explored by its methods. Religion has in the past tried mistakenly to place its restrictions on the freedom of scientific enquiry. It is now recognized by the great majority of educated Christians that whatever can be scientifically studied may properly be so studied, and that it is no part of revelation or of theology to pronounce upon questions which fall within the sphere of science as such. "A religious interpretation of nature never worries about what things are—that is a problem for scientists."² But since the dividing-line between the matter-of-factness of science and interpretations, attitudes, and regulative ideals which lie quite outside that matter-of-factness is not always easy to observe in practice, science may implicitly or explicitly raise issues that fall within the field of religion. The real debate between religion and science hinges on the question whether science discloses the whole meaning, or is capable of dealing with the whole conduct, of life. In the consideration of this crucial issue there are important questions, in the right decision of which religion is vitally concerned, but which are not in themselves specifically religious questions but matters to be debated and decided in the sphere of rational discussion. This may be illustrated in relation to four large questions which fall within the humanist field but have an important bearing on religious belief.

The first question has to do with the twofold nature of human experience. Man's experience is not limited to the contemplation and investigation of objects, which is the field of science. He is also an experiencing, living, active subject, compelled at every moment to make decisions. The crucial nature of this distinction is insisted on in a recent book by a leading physicist, Dr. C. F. von Weizsäcker. The deepest rift, he maintains, in the edifice of science today is the cleavage between the natural sciences and the

2 Gilson, Etienne. *God and Philosophy*, p. 119.

humanities. In reality these two views are two half-circles which need to be joined so that they combine to form a full circle. Nature is prior to man, but it is man who knows what nature is. Being is older than knowledge, but only knowledge knows what being is. "Nature is of the mind—she can be thought in mathematical terms. This, perhaps, is the deepest truth we know of nature."³ Man, who is in this way the knower of nature,

does not know himself as a being that one could study with detachment. He always finds himself faced with demands on him, demands that he must follow or reject. Misery, anguish, hope, love, hate, custom, conscience, fellow-man, and God make demands on him. Much of man's knowledge of himself can be expressed properly not as a statement, but only as an imperative. . . . After all, theory must serve the life it interprets. Theory does not relieve us of decisions—all it can do is to show us the consequences of our decision for one course of action or another.⁴

A similar insistence on the duality of human experience is found in A. A. Bowman's *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion*. Life is revealed to us as an observable phenomenon, but it is at the same time, he maintains, revealed to us as an experienced existence, and this not merely as a succession of episodic experiences, but as a comprehensive experience of having experiences, i.e., as possessing a total meaning.⁵ It is to man as experiencing subject, as knowing anxiety, misery, frustration, moral failure, and the necessity of decision—to man as, in Sartre's language, "condemned to be free"—that religion addresses its appeal. It is consequently vital to religion that the dual nature of human experience should never be left out of sight. When life is thought of exclusively in terms of observable phenomena and technical control, it has been identified by an initial choice with one of the two half-circles of which von Weizsäcker speaks, whereas they ought to be joined in such a way that they combine to form a full circle.

Those who reject the possibility of any knowledge of a reality transcending science and common sense hold that there is no sense

3 Von Weizsäcker, Carl F. *The History of Nature*, p. 13.

4 *Ibid.*, pp. 157-158.

5 Vol. 2, pp. 336-339.

in attributing objective validity to aesthetic judgments. In contrast with this view, Herbert Read maintains that the human mind cannot be regarded as a "domain of mere indifferent facts but that intrinsic demands, fittingness and its opposite, wrongness, occur among the genuine characteristics of its contents. Let us for the moment give the name value to this common trait of intrinsic requiredness or wrongness, and let us call insight all awareness of such intellectual, moral, or aesthetic value. We can then say that value and corresponding insight constitute the very essence of human life."⁶ Susanne Langer, writing of Hegel, says that he did not realize that intelligence is not to be restricted to discursive forms—that there is such a process as non-discursive thought, and that the mind develops, and apprehends reality, as much by imagination and dream, by myth and ritual, by art, in short, as by practical intelligence. It is mere presumption to claim the essence and intimacy of the mind for abstract thought; that arcane region is reserved, if for anything, for acts of symbolic transformation, for the formative intuitions of the great artist. This does not imply any necessary opposition between science and art. The imagination is certainly not absent from the higher ranges of scientific activity. Neither is it suggested that the aesthetic and the religious attitude are identical, or that the former is a stage on the way to the latter. They may be in sharp opposition. Aestheticism may be a substitute for faith, which demands decision, whereas the aesthetic attitude may be that of a spectator. But throughout history there has been a close relation between art and religion. Art has an affinity with worship, whereas science may too easily minister to the desire for power.

A third point at which the scientific attitude falls short of comprehending the fullness of life is closely related to the first that was mentioned. Science can offer no complete account of the phenomenon of encounter.

Life is not, primarily, as is generally taken for granted, a vast collective enterprise in which individuals cooperate to subdue nature to their purposes.

6 Read, Herbert. *Education through Art*, p. 298.

For the setting of that enterprise is an arena in which a multitude of separately existing persons, and groups of persons, with conflicting purposes, are in continual collision with one another. That is the bed-rock fact of social existence. . . . The world of encounter has a more pungent reality than the world which man explores, because in it we come up against real limits. . . . In the world of encounter we meet with contradiction. Another will, as real as our own, challenges ours. . . . It is certainly true that human encounter, when it has taken place, becomes an event in the objective world which can be studied by the methods of science. But until the encounter has taken place there is always the possibility that it may be other than is expected; and the richer the personality the greater is the possibility of surprise. . . . The knowledge which science can give us of the factors involved in the endlessly varied encounters between persons and groups is indispensable, if we are to learn to deal with them rightly. But necessary as scientific knowledge is, it is not enough. We cannot know the meaning of encounter except by leaving the spectator's bench and entering the arena. The deepest and most important experiences of life cannot be known from the outside but only by sharing the experience. They can be learned only by being lived, not by intellectual study, but by self-commitment, endurance and suffering. That is the profound truth which scientific humanism is apt to forget.⁷

The assumption that the methods which have met with such astonishing success in the conquest of nature can be used with equal effectiveness for the ordering and control of human society is one which calls for thorough examination. There is no question that psychology, sociology, and the social sciences generally have immense and indispensable contributions to make to the unravelling of the complexities of social life. But it may well be that the distinctive and peculiar thing about man is precisely that he refuses to submit to scientific management. It is in this living world of the demands and responses of persons that religion has its meaning.

The fourth point at which the scientific attitude may not be comprehensive is the nature of truth. The widespread tendency to value science primarily for utilitarian reasons, to identify truth with scientific truth and to define the latter in a particular way raises in an acute form, as Michael Polanyi has seen, the question

7 Bragg, L. *The Era of Atomic Power*, pp. 70-72.

of the nature and foundation of beliefs, including the belief in science. He has called attention in a number of publications to this fundamental issue. "The method of disbelieving every proposition which cannot be verified by definitely prescribed operations would destroy all belief in natural science."⁸ Further,

We are living in the midst of a period requiring great readjustments. One of these is to learn once more to hold beliefs, our own beliefs. The task is formidable for we have been taught for centuries to hold as a belief only the residue which no doubt can conceivably assail. There is no such residue left today, and that is why the ability to believe with open eyes must once more be systematically acquired. Liberalism itself is today becoming conscious of its fiduciary foundations.⁹

Intellectual freedom, Polanyi contends, can be preserved and flourish only within a community and a tradition. The crucial idea which he raises is that science, too, is a matter of faith along with religion. Are the two faiths irrevocably opposed?

II. THE SECULAR AND RELIGIOUS ATTITUDES TO LIFE

The questions thus far considered lie within the rational, humanist sphere, though the conclusions reached regarding them are important for the religious understanding of life. There is a fundamental difference between the secular and religious attitudes of life. The deepest cleavage which divides men in the world today is that between the belief that the whole meaning of man's life is found in the temporal, secular sphere, and the belief that he is related to a transcendent reality. The conception of the secular is a creation of the religious mind itself, it should be remembered, and indeed of Christianity. In order to arrive at a true conception of God it was necessary for religion to distinguish between nature and God, and between man and God. Only in this way could religion become fully theistic, and theism truly spiritual. The ques-

8 Polanyi, M. *Science, Faith, and Society*, p. 62.

9 Polanyi, M. *Logic of Liberty*, p. 109.

tion then arises whether in thus distinguishing a sphere in which man can, if he chooses, live without God, religion has not created a rival and autonomous interest, which must in the end prove destructive of religion itself. On this decision the future of mankind hinges. No one has perceived this more clearly than Nietzsche. It might take two centuries, he asserted, for the question even to be *heard* in its full gravity.

A purely this-worldly attitude is a state of mind with which the higher religions have always had to contend. The religious life never escapes from the downward pull of a deep-seated spiritual inertia. There is a bias toward secularism as old and enduring as human nature itself. What is distinctive of the contemporary situation is that science, which is concerned solely with the empirical world, has acquired such prestige as to seem to offer rational justification for an attitude which has deeper roots. In the modern times the loss of belief is in part a product of the domination of imagination over reason, and of the coercion of the imagination by the over-all picture of the world presented by contemporary science and the impression made by science itself in its extraordinary development—the impression that *here* is an enterprise of thought that is, in principle, omni-competent. The only thing reason can do to correct this state of affairs is to call attention to the fact and nature of it, and so to put people on their guard. The extent to which this can effectively be done with men in the mass is uncertain. Outspoken unanimity on the matter among distinguished scientists, however, would do more than equally valid pronouncements by those who in relation to science are laymen.

The choice between the secular and religious views of life depends in the last resort on a presupposition or “basic acceptance.” This presupposition is the choosing to explore a certain form of thought and experience, with a readiness to accept whatever is found and to submit to its influence upon outlook, character, and destiny. The scientific presupposition is that the universe is a natural order describable in causal categories—and only that. In contrast with this there is the metaphysical presupposition that

the universe is governed by a purpose. The presupposition at the heart of Christian thinking is that the universe is controlled by God. These presuppositions have the same properties and status. They are not self-evident truths nor pieces of knowledge gathered from experience, but presuppositions made as a result of a basic acceptance. They are prejustified because they enable the opening of a field of experience which cannot be opened up without them and lead to discoveries which have a close bearing on human interests. They give significance to situations and/or facts and raise questions and give rise to theories of a distinctive kind. Their post-justification lies in the fact that theories do arise in each case which cover the known facts, point the way for further enquiries, and enable important and beneficial action. These assumptions cannot be demonstrated to those who do not share them.

I do not assume that I can force my view on my opponents by arguments. Though I accept truth as existing independently of my knowledge of it, and as accessible to all men, I admit my inability to compel anyone to see it. . . . Yet when the metaphysical believer cannot hope to convince, he may still strive to convert. Though powerless to argue with the nihilist he may succeed in conveying to him the intimation of a mental satisfaction which he is lacking; and this intimation may start in him a process of conversion.¹⁰

The holder of the secular view conceives the *historical* existence as the only reality. The religious view, on the other hand, is rooted in the realization that the spirit of man cannot find rest and abiding satisfaction in the present world. The two ways of understanding the world are so wide apart that it is difficult, and often impossible, for the one to understand the other. What is sanity in one view is insanity in the other. To the secularist the religious view is an obstacle preventing men from getting down to their real problems and dealing with them. To the religious mind the secular attitude is an intolerable simplification of the mystery of existence.

The crucial difference between the secular and religious view—belief in a transcendent, personal God—cannot be profitably dis-

10 Polanyi, M. *Science, Faith, and Society*, p. 67.

cussed in this age. The topic is too vast, and particular meanings and difficulties can best be expounded and considered separately. The contemporary problem, moreover, is different from that of an earlier generation. In the nineteenth century those who attacked the belief in God as creator and loving Father, no less than those who defended these beliefs, thought that they were denying or asserting a significant proposition. Today the problem is different. For many minds both the assertion and the denial have ceased to mean anything, because the terms themselves have become meaningless. Several things must be settled before there can be any discussion—or resolution—of the crucial difference between the two views. What, in more precise terms, are the things which those who no longer believe in God wish to deny? What are the specific things which those who profess to believe in God wish to assert? What practical difference does belief in God make in the conduct of life?

A difficulty which those who believe in a providential ordering of the world have to meet has been focally stated by Professor Barbara Wootton. To her and to many others today it appears that religion is fighting a losing and hopeless battle against the scientific view of the world, that the fierce battles of the nineteenth century between the two views resulted in the triumphant victory of the latter, and that the retreat of religion into the spiritual sphere leaves it with an inactive deity that does not make any difference to the ordinary visible events of daily life. It is held, further, that the impact of the social sciences on the traditional religious view is likely to be still more disturbing and deadly. If the advance of science into the whole field of human experience and relations shows that not only physical occurrences but mental, moral, and spiritual experience are under the control of impersonal and unalterable law, God makes less and less difference to living and the difference between a religious and secular interpretation of the universe becomes negligible.¹¹

11 Wootton, B. *Testament for Social Science*, pp. 112-116.

III. MORAL VALUES

Everyone, secularist and religionist alike, seems to be alarmed at the departure of twentieth century man from the moral values of the past. Everyone is concerned with educating in the moral values so as to "preserve civilization." This is not the place to attempt to give a full or exact account of the values in question. But in general they may be presumed to include the commonly accepted moral values, such as the pursuit of truth, the promotion of justice, respect for other persons, freedom of conscience, toleration, benevolence, magnanimity, and compassion.

These values are undoubtedly Christian values in the sense that in the Christian view they belong to the created moral nature of man. It is also arguable from the Christian point of view that the Christian affirmation and sanction of them is necessary for their preservation in face of the forces by which they are threatened in the modern world. But it is also true that they are accepted and cherished by many who do not call themselves Christians and that they existed before the advent of Christianity and are found among peoples professing other religions than Christianity. In the language of Christian theology, moreover, they belong to man's created, as distinct from redeemed, nature, however much their meaning may be illuminated and deepened by redeeming grace. For these reasons it seems preferable to refer to them as the human rather than the Christian values.

This discrimination has the further advantage that it calls attention to the fact that in the present state of the world it is man's *humanity* that is in danger. Powerful forces are operating to destroy or undermine the ways of life which result from the acceptance of the values in question. Recent history furnishes abundant evidence of the consequences of the abandonment of the belief in the reality of reason and justice, as the result of which individuals, nations, and classes regard themselves as emancipated from all obligations superior to their own interests and frankly accept appetite and force as the ultimate arbiters in human affairs.

What has happened in Europe is described by Polanyi in these words:

The destruction of our civilization over large stretches of the continent was not due to some accidental outburst of Fascist beastliness. The events which, starting from the Russian Revolution, have ravaged the continent represent on the contrary a single coherent process: one vast general upheaval. Great waves of humanitarianism and patriotic sentiments were its prime impulses, and it was these sentiments which actuated the destruction of Europe. Savagery is always there lurking among us; but it can break loose on a grand scale only when rebellious moral passions first break up the controls of civilization. . . . We must ask, therefore, why moral forces could be thus perverted, why the great social passions of our time were turned into violent and destructive channels? The answer can only be that there was no other channel available to them. A radical scepticism had destroyed popular belief in the reality of justice and reason. It has stamped these ideas as mere superstructures; as out-of-date ideologies of a bourgeois age; as mere screens for selfish interests hiding behind them; and indeed, as sources of confusion and weakness to anyone who would trust in them. . . . There was no sufficiently strong belief in justice and reason left in which to embody social passions. A generation grew up full of moral fire and yet despising reason and justice. Believing instead in what?—in the forces which were left for them to believe in—in Power, Economic Interest, Subconscious Desire. These they accepted therefore as the ultimate reality to which they could entrust themselves.¹²

The doctrines which have worked such havoc on the continent of Europe have not in England and America disrupted to quite the same extent the traditional pattern of life. The decay of religious belief has not yet led to a sweeping moral decline. "I don't believe," says a thoughtful writer, "that the position will alter much within the next few years; a large-scale conversion to orthodoxy is the dream of idle minds, as the fears that the world will throw the entire Christian tradition overboard are nightmares which come from sharing a late supper with St. Thomas Aquinas."¹³

Habits persist long after the faith which helped to form them has been abandoned. But it would be dangerous to assume that

12 Polanyi, M. *Logic of Liberty*, pp. 4-5.

13 Churchill, R. C. *Disagreements*, p. 217.

complete scepticism in regard to moral obligation will not in the end have far-reaching effects upon conduct. There is plenty of evidence that forms of determinism which are believed to render moral choice and responsibility illusory are exerting an influence in wide circles. Many who do not accept the Marxist creed as a whole have adopted the materialistic view of history and its fatalistic consequences. Others draw determinist conclusions from the teachings of biology, psychology, and sociology. Leading representatives of a dominant school in philosophy (Logical Positivism) maintain that ethical judgments "have no objective validity whatsoever,"¹⁴ and that "ethics, as a branch of knowledge, is nothing more than a department of psychology and sociology."¹⁵ These conclusions about the nature of ethics are held to apply to aesthetics and theology equally well.

The moral perplexities which arise in actual life are of widely different kinds, and the recognition of these differences is important. In the first place, the perplexity may have to do with the moral propriety of a particular act or policy. What is doubted is not the reality of objective values, nor the rightness of certain basic valuations, though this may not always be plain to the individual, since he may never have made his basic valuations clear to himself. In such cases the help that is needed is clarification of the standards in the light of which he does, in fact, assess each situation, and enlightenment in regard to the *facts* of the situation in which the particular decision has to be made and of the implications of each course that might be adopted.

A second more fundamental perplexity arises when it is the governing ideals themselves that are called in question or where one set of valuations comes into conflict with another. Where such conflict arises within the mind of an individual or between individuals or groups, the matter cannot be settled by argument, though reasons for each view can be advanced and weighed. But though no demonstrative proof can be offered in favor of one view as against another, it does not follow, many would hold,

14 Ayer, A. J. *Language, Truth and Logic*, p. 108.

15 *Ibid.*, p. 112.

that a choice between them cannot be rational. The nature of the ultimate deciding factor is a matter calling for philosophical examination and elucidation. But it is a fact of experience that when a man sincerely and loyally commits himself to certain valuations and a certain way of living, he finds in experience growing confirmation of his chosen beliefs or, alternatively, grounds for modifying or abandoning them.

The most radical perplexity relates to belief or disbelief in objective values altogether. Here the issue would seem to be whether the data available from the *observer* standpoint are to be held as ruling out rational convictions characteristic of, and in part constitutive of, the *agent* standpoint; whether, that is to say, the standpoint of science is the only legitimate standpoint. In that case what seem, at least at first sight, to be certain rational convictions must be held to be "transcendental illusions." But here again no demonstrative proof can be offered of the truths of either view. Each is what was described earlier as a basic acceptance.

Thus, while the moral life, individual and social, provides abundant data for rational enquiry, it seems that the sense of moral obligation is in the last analysis derived from religious belief.

The supreme and comprehensive obligation we may describe as the *obligation to be obliged*, or the moral necessity of so conducting the whole business of life that in all our relations, both with material things and with our fellows, every one of us may assert his nature as a person, bound to give an account of himself, not to his peers, but to a universal personal authority whom men call God.¹⁶

This assertion is widely disputed today and is, consequently, one of the main issues. The secularists do not see any necessary connection between ethics and theology. Ethics is thought of only as the distilled wisdom of mankind on how to behave in order to be happy and/or to preserve existence both communal and individual. The question then has to be asked whether secularists recognize any moral absolute. If so, what is its nature? If they

16 Bowman, A. A. *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion*, v. II, p. 103.

do not, what defense have they against subjectivism and moral anarchy? Is science competent, as is popularly believed, to afford guidance in the conduct of life? There are many specific moral questions in regard to which there may be expected to be a difference between secularists and Christians as a result of their respective presuppositions. As, for example, how important is personal happiness? What is the moral value of self-sacrifice?

IV. THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION

Thus far the concern has been with a consideration of the presuppositions of religious faith rather than with that faith itself. This is not unwarranted since the contemporary state of opinion demands first of all clarification of the nature of presuppositions. But examination of the existence of data and methods of inquiry other than those of natural science does no more than establish the *formal possibility* of a rational faith. It can at the best bring about an open-mindedness in regard to the fundamental issues. It does nothing to produce conviction of the *real possibility and necessity* of a living faith. Christianity is more than the assertion of the reality of a transcendent world. It claims to be a *revelation* of the nature and meaning of that transcendent reality.

It is precisely this claim to particularity that is the stumbling-block for many minds. Many feel as Professor J. N. Findlay that those who organize their lives in terms of worshipping a particular deity "almost always end by attaching unique significance to particular books, persons, events, ceremonies, institutions and what not, and that they tend almost inevitably to discriminate against those who may love the same worshipful properties, but who do not connect them with the existent particulars in question."¹⁷ Since Findlay regards all such discrimination as wicked, he cannot think favorably of the religious claims which lead to them.

The claims of Christianity to be a revelation of the divine purpose and of the true meaning of human existence are obviously

17 Findlay, J. N. *University*, Vol. I, No. 2, p. 98.

controversial and the burden of proof lies with neither side but there must be serious, intelligent discussion. Since, moreover, Christianity is a historical religion, a critical examination of the historical facts on which revelation rests must fill an important place in the discussion. The time seems to be ripe for an attempt to present so far as is possible an objective view of the present conclusions of historical research in regard to the Christian origins, and for a discussion of the relation of these facts to Christian faith and doctrine.

It is commonly taken for granted nowadays that liberalism and modernism have been outgrown or invalidated. But how far and why are they invalid? There is a danger of taking advantage of the present discomfiture of liberalism by reintroducing the assumption of a pre-scientific age simply because nineteenth century rationalism, or humanism, has proved insufficient. Christianity has to *face* rival and hostile philosophies and attitudes today. Can it recommend itself as an acceptable (not to say, as the only compelling) alternative to these, if it adheres to the creeds in their present form? Is there no form in which Christianity can be presented to the non-religious world (i.e., most people today) without demanding belief in myth and fables accepted as history in the past? Christianity is often rejected and ignored today, not because its moral demands are too severe, but because it is thought to demand too much "humbug" ("You don't mean to say you believe all *that?*").

Christianity further claims to be a religion of *salvation*. There is a wide range of questions for fruitful discussion in regard to the relation between the salvation which it offers and the integration of personality which modern psychotherapy seeks to bring about.

Of crucial importance is the question of a future life, not as a mere desire for the prolongation of life in its present form and personal survival, but in its bearing on the quality of human existence. The modern mind tends to dismiss the possibility of a future life as an idle dream. The possibility of a life beyond present historical existence is to some minds a meaningless abstraction and

undesirable ideal. Herbert Read expresses the attitude when he writes :

Perhaps fatalism is the best word to describe my permanent attitude to this problem. My favorite symbol is the Tree of Life. The human race is the trunk and branches of the tree, and individual men are the leaves which appear one season, flourish for a summer, and then die. I am like a leaf of this tree, and one day I shall decay and fall, and become a pinch of compost about its roots. But meanwhile I am conscious of the tree's flowing sap and steadfast strength. Deep down in my consciousness is the consciousness of a collective life, a life of which I am a part and to which I contribute a minute but unique extension. When I die and fall, the tree remains, nourished to some small degree by my brief manifestation of life. Millions of leaves have preceded me and millions will follow me ; the tree itself grows and endures.¹⁸

Not all the secularists, however, are able to reconcile themselves to the limitations of man's life to the brief period of his earthly existence, and the hope of immortality persists.

Père de Lubac has called attention to the remarkable fact that the Christian message of a personal God, the redeemer of his creation, which came to the ancient world as an immense deliverance, freeing men from the tyranny of blind fate and lifting them on a new wave of hope, is felt by the modern temper to be an unwelcome yoke, depriving man of a dignity and responsibility that are properly his own.¹⁹ Can Christianity give justification to its teaching in our age? Are the reasons for the restricting of man's horizon to his earthly existence of compelling cogency? Do they transform, as Sir Charles Sherrington has suggested, "the human spirit's task, almost beyond recognition, to one of loftier responsibility?"²⁰ Or, on the contrary, does this attitude diminish man's stature and dignity as these have been understood by leading minds in Christendom?

18 Read, H. *Annals of Innocence and Experience*, p. 110.

19 De Lubac, P. *The Drama of Atheistic Humanism*, pp. 4-6.

20 Sherrington, C. *Man on His Nature*, p. 404.

Notes and Studies

THE PRINTED LESSONS IN THE NEW SERVICE BOOK

A REPORT

When the Joint Commission on the Liturgy met for its final meeting to authorize the final text of the Service Book and Hymnal, it had to reach a decision on the matter of the version to be used in the lections, the text of the Authorized Version or of the Revised Standard Version. A Committee of the Commission had given this controversial subject thorough study and prepared a report as a basis for its recommendation. The report, slightly amended, was unanimously adopted by the Commission. The contents of the report indicate the desire of the Commission to consider every aspect of the problem, and includes decisions of the Church which are of historic importance. In the belief that the document will be of general interest, the *Quarterly* has provided space for it.

—EDITOR

The Committee on the text of the printed lessons recommends that neither text be printed in the new service book, but that separate lectionaries be published containing the Epistles and Gospels and Old Testament lessons, these lectionaries to be available in either of the respective texts.

Such action by the Commission on the Liturgy will be disappointing to those advocates of the Revised Standard Version of the Bible who had hoped that the Lutheran Church might become the first major body to adopt the new version as its official text. It will also be disappointing to those who hoped that the Commission would stand by its actions of 1947 and 1951 and print the Authorized Version text in the new *Service Book and Hymnal*. It is also disappointing to the Commission itself, which regrets the fact that most of our churches, having arrived at the point where their members expect and look for the Epistles and Gospels to be printed in their service books, must now take a backward step and omit them. Their absence is further regretted because it had

been planned, in the new book, to make them more usable than ever by cross-references to them in other services and orders where their use would have been most appropriate.

Any other solution, however, short of the publication of two editions, would force an undesired text on half the church. The publication of two editions would increase the cost of both editions and would create great problems of storage and distribution. It would also prevent precisely what the Commission's action is intended to facilitate, namely, the experimental use of the RSV at a minimum expense. The price of the new book is not yet known, but it is safe to say that a congregation's capital investment will be substantial. Change from one edition to another would be expensive—so expensive that this factor alone would discourage it. The provision of relatively inexpensive lectionaries in both the AV and RSV texts will make possible experimentation and, if desired, change from one to the other without jeopardizing a substantial investment in the new books.

This decision is admittedly a compromise. The Commission on the Liturgy is composed of seventeen members representing eight churches. The largest delegation—numbering five—is from the United Lutheran Church. The Commission can not be bound by the action of any single church body. In this case, the expressed opinions of the churches are not unanimous, and the Commission has had to adopt as satisfactory an agreement as could be reached among conflicting points of view. The official actions of the four major bodies, as forwarded to the Commission by their respective secretaries (unless otherwise noted), are:

1. The American Lutheran Church (Waverly, Iowa, October, 1952)

“Resolved to approve and encourage the use of the RSV of the Bible for (a) private study and devotion; (b) in the teaching ministry of the parish; (c) as an alternative in the liturgical lessons, and be it further resolved that we instruct our members on the Hymnal Commission to vote for the inclusion of the RSV in the pericope lessons so that the above may be implemented without prejudice to the previous version.

"Since the American Lutheran Church has never officially recognized any version, the present situation does not call for an official either-or action whereby one version would supplant or exclude another. The King James Version, our cherished heritage, will continue to hold a prominent place in the esteem and use of the church. A final evaluation of the RSV of the Bible can come only through the long range historical validation of the Church's actual use."

2. The Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church (Des Moines, Iowa, June, 1952)

"Resolved that pursuant to the Church's decision of last year, we urge the use of the RSV of the Scriptures in the pericopes of the new hymnal and for general use in our homes and churches. *Resolved* that the Augustana Book Concern be directed to make necessary arrangements to publish a special edition of the Common Hymnal and Service Book with the pericopes (lessons) in the text of the RSV; and that the congregations of the Church be given the option of purchasing the hymnals with the pericopes either in the language of the King James Version or the RSV."

3. The Evangelical Lutheran Church (from President J. A. Aasgaard to Commission Chairman Luther D. Reed)

"Our Convention did not take any action on the RSV of the Scriptures. Our Convention was held in June, several months before the Bible was ready. Passing any resolution in respect to it would seem strange procedure when no one really had had the opportunity to even in a superficial way read a reasonable part of the new Bible. I believe that a committee will be appointed by our Church Council at its February meeting to consider the matter of its being used in the pericopes."

4. The United Lutheran Church in America (Seattle, Wash., October, 1952)

"Resolved that this Convention instruct the Committee on Worship to request the Joint Commission on the Liturgy and the Hymnal to have printed in the new Service Book the text of the RSV as that of the stated lessons for the day."

In considering these proposals, the Commission finds that the one common factor is a desire to permit the use of the RSV. The

United Lutheran Church desires the RSV text alone; the American Lutheran Church desires a solution which would permit the use of the RSV "without prejudice to the previous version"; the Augustana Church would like a similar option, but implements it by proposing two editions of the book; the Evangelical Lutheran Church has the matter under study. Since the Commission is the servant of the churches, it finds that it must, therefore, recognize an expressed desire for provision for the use of the RSV text.

The Commission had itself already recognized such a desire. In its official reply to the 1951 request of the Augustana Church, reported to all the churches in 1952, it stated: "The Commission is not in any sense attempting to preclude the use of versions other than the AV at public services, either in addition to, or in place of, the AV." Apparently this statement either passed by unnoticed or was not satisfactory—perhaps because it would not have placed the *printed* RSV text in the hands of the people. In view of this expressed desire, the Commission has reached its compromise decision.

In doing so, it does not, however, yield its own opinion reached after three separate and careful studies of all the factors involved in such liturgical use. This opinion, first reported to the cooperating churches in 1948, and approved by them, and reaffirmed unanimously by the Commission in December, 1951, was that the AV, with certain minor changes, be printed in the book as the text for the Epistles and Gospels.

Because of its stand, the Commission has been subject to sharp attack. This has been particularly true in the columns of one of the official papers of one of the cooperating churches, where even the official statement of the Commission on this question was edited to make it less damaging to an unfounded charge against it which had previously appeared. There has also been widespread agitation by traveling representatives of certain church boards, who have been promoting the liturgical use of the RSV from coast to coast. Regardless of the personal and private opinions of some of its members, the Commission would not presume to enlighten the church on the suitability or lack of it of the RSV in, for in-

stance, the field of religious education. Unfortunately, this attitude of the Commission has proved to be unilateral!

For the question is not one of the AV vs. the RSV. It is not one even of the *use* of the AV vs. the RSV—even in the Epistles and Gospels for the day. It is solely one of which text would be *printed* in the forthcoming official liturgy of the Lutheran Church. In every one of its statements the Commission has been careful to emphasize this precise definition of the question. Yet there have been few speakers or writers who have confined themselves to the question actually under discussion.

This is partly due to the wave of mass enthusiasm on behalf of the RSV which swept over American Protestantism last fall. The members of the Augustana Church could not have, and the majority of the members of the United Lutheran Church and the American Lutheran Church had not, read the full text of the lessons involved before they voted in their respective conventions. At the Seattle Convention of the United Lutheran Church, 43 delegates, button-holed at random in the lobby of the Olympia Hotel, were asked, "Have you read the full text (including the Old Testament) of the Epistles and Gospels proposed for the new book, in the RSV?" Only 10, or 23 per cent, said "yes." Yet 27 of the 43, indicated they would vote for the RSV when the question came up! It requires some grace to define this as intelligent voting!

Despite all this, the Commission has tried to keep its consideration of the question on a high and objective level. It has refrained from answering attacks which were at times quite personal. It has not retaliated in kind to charges which have impugned its motives. It did not attempt to forestall action on the question at the 1952 conventions by rushing copy to the press. It wishes that its critics would have seen fit to meet it on the same plane and on the basis of the actual question at issue. But because it has been difficult for it even to secure a fair hearing, it welcomes this opportunity to state in some detail why it thinks as it does—not so much in the hope of winning converts as with the purpose of recording certain facts and opinions hitherto unpublished.

The Commission does feel qualified to speak on the question when it is clearly defined. Since 1946, it has been engaged in the most intensive study of the liturgy being made currently by any English-speaking group. It does not speak lightly on this question, but out of experience, scholarship and research in the precise area concerned. Its membership includes not only a number of professors for whom the study of the liturgy has been a life-long occupation, but also pastors of wide experience who are sensitive to the present needs of the people. The Commission has been continually aware not only of sound historical tradition, but also of practical expediency. In all of its deliberations—including the question of the printing of the RSV text for the Epistles and Gospels—it has learned to weigh any innovation in the light of the accumulated experience of the Church, and to check any historic practice by its contemporary applicability.

The Commission is not opposed to the RSV as such. It is not opposed to its use in our churches—even for the stated Epistles and Gospels. But it believes that the RSV should not be prejudged, either favorably or unfavorably, on the short acquaintance which has so far been possible. The more free translation of the RSV may seem at times to make the meaning clearer. But when translation becomes too free it becomes paraphrase and interpolation, rather than translation. Note Romans 4:16, which in the AV reads, "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace" and in the RSV reads, "That is why it depends on faith, in order that the promise may rest on grace." Doctrinal truth is involved here, as it is in other passages. Some pastors, who are members of the Commission, have used the RSV experimentally in public worship, and they are quick to point out that, while there are some improvements, there are also many shortcomings in the stated Epistles and Gospels, a few of which follow.

"Now it is high time" becomes "Now it is full time"; "Let us walk honestly" becomes "Let us conduct ourselves becomingly"; "coming in at that instant," is "coming up at that very hour"; "let us make here three tabernacles" is "I will make three booths here"; "past finding out" becomes "inscrutable"; "afflictions" become "ex-

perience of suffering." "Thy faith hath made thee whole" is "your faith has made you well." Instead of "putting away lying" we are "putting away falsehood" and "wherein is excess" becomes "for that is debauchery." Instead of "into the highways" we have "to the thoroughfares." The God of "patience and consolation" has become the God of "steadfastness and encouragement." They went out into the wilderness not "to see" but "to behold." In each of these cases, the RSV text uses words less current in English use today than the AV word it replaces, and in many cases a word whose meaning is less clear and occasionally more difficult to pronounce. While the subjunctive mood has generally been avoided in the RSV, the AV's "blessed is he that cometh" becomes "blessed be he."

The principal has become the janitor as the AV's "schoolmaster" is changed to "custodian." "Ungodly" is rendered "impious"—a word far more obtuse and one which will be mispronounced far and wide. Other changes are sheer caprice. The AV says, "astonished at his understanding and answers. And when they saw him they were amazed." Says the RSV, "amazed at his understanding and answers, and when they saw him they were astonished." We learn, after all these centuries, that they were really amazed first and astonished later, instead of vice versa! We are now to keep ourselves "unstained" by the world instead of "unspotted." And the AV's "breadth and length and depth and height" has become the RSV's "breadth and length and height and depth!"

Now is there much improvement in rendering "superfluity" as "rank growth" or "gazing" as "looking" or "departed" as "went their way," or "dry places" as "waterless places," "with well doing" as "by doing right," or "edify one another" as "build one another up"? Our language today is, if anything, more forthright—yet we find "hell" rendered "hades" and "hell fire" as "the hell of fire." We are no longer warned not to "commit fornication" but only not to "indulge in immorality." And when we come to "penny" and "pence"—words which appear on four Sundays, the meaning is really put in living language when we read "denarius" and "denarii." And anyone who renders "verily, verily" (which occurs

on eight Sundays) as "truly, truly" certainly has a peculiar idea of contemporary English. Ronald Knox translates it "believe me."

These are only a few samples, culled from a large number of instances in the stated Epistles and Gospels in which the RSV is either no better, or is actually less clear than the AV. The same caprice for changing time-honored phrases that has, in other places, rendered classic English expressions like "clear as crystal" "bright as crystal," "the powers that be" as "those that are," and the widow's "mite" into "two copper coins which make a penny" is evident in the stated lessons for the day. We doubt if "white-washed tombs" is any improvement on "whited sepulchres."

There is another more subtle matter, of which few are consciously aware, yet the effect of which is unconsciously noted by even the casual reader or listener—and that is the question of rhythm. The characteristic prose rhythm of the AV is dactylic or anapestic—combinations of one long and two short syllables. This is the smooth-flowing meter of classical Latin, of which the 1611 translators were deeply conscious. It is hard to believe that the translators of the RSV even thought about it. In more than 200 cases in the Epistles and Gospels the rhythm has been destroyed. A few examples follow.

why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ (AV)
then why are you baptizing, if you are neither the Christ (RSV)

when men have well drunk, then that which is worse (AV)
when men have drunk freely, then the poor wine (RSV)

a night and a day I have been in the deep (AV)
a night and a day I have been adrift at sea (RSV)

whether it be to the king as supreme (AV)
whether it be to the emperor as supreme (RSV)

but one receiveth the prize (AV)
but only one receives the prize (RSV)

marvel not that I said unto thee (AV)
do not marvel that I said to you (RSV)

It is quite naive to suppose that the elimination of -eth and -est from verb endings is simply a matter of changing archaic forms. By eliminating a short syllable, it also changes the characteristic dactylic and anapestic meter to iambic or trochaic. Similarly, the elimination of Hebraisms has impaired the meter :

and it came to pass that the beggar died (AV)
the poor man died (RSV)

Jesus answered and said unto him (AV)
Jesus answered him (RSV)

for divers of them came from far (AV)
and some of them have come a long way (RSV)

In this last example, we hold no brief for the word "divers" but it might have been translated "many" without ruining the rhythm at all. The elimination of seventeenth century prepositions has also had its effect:

but what went ye out for to see (AV)
why then did you go out (RSV)

be made known unto God (AV)
be made known to God (RSV)

In a little known work entitled *Certain Rhythms in the English Bible* (Cornell University Press, 1952, p. 15), a distinguished scholar and literary critic, Dr. Lane Cooper, says: "Where the sense is clear, the rhythmical pattern is of more value than a literal (and pedantic) translation of any given word. If that principle is right, virtually all of the recent translations of the Bible that I have seen or listened to are defective, and miss the mark, not only for wayfaring men, but for scholars." Those who are conscious of the importance of prose rhythm find the RSV text quite defective.

The Commission is further concerned over the tenuous "authorization" of the RSV. There has been a consistent campaign to play down the use of AV for the Bible of 1611, though that is

its standard commentary abbreviation, and to play up the RSV as "authorized."

The AV of 1611 was authorized by James I, not as King of England, but as the then head of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, and as such the leader of 90 per cent of the English-speaking Christians of his day. The RSV, on the other hand, has yet to receive the *official* imprimatur of any of the much greater number of English-speaking churches now in existence. It was prepared under the auspices of the International Council of Religious Education (ICRE) which is now the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A. (NCCCCUSA). The ICRE was a cooperative agency—a voluntary association of individuals representing boards of education and publication of some of the Protestant churches of America. The data which follow are drawn from *Our Bible in the Making* (Westminster Press, 1952, pp. 105-106 et al.), by Herbert Gordon May, one of the translators of the RSV. This book is the recommended text for the National Council of Churches Leadership Course No. 120 1-b, and may, therefore, be regarded as a quasi-official apologia.

The American Standard Version (1901), commonly designated ARV, was copyrighted by Thomas Nelson & Sons "to protect it from unauthorized changes." In 1928 this copyright was transferred to the ICRE, which thereupon established the Standard Bible Committee "to be custodian of the text of the American Standard Version." The Committee was "authorized to undertake a revision of the translation if it were thought advisable." This authorization was given it by the ICRE. The Committee's work was suspended in 1932 for lack of funds. Effort was made "to find someone to underwrite the expenses and a syndicate of publishers to produce the new version. When Thomas Nelson & Sons agreed to do this, they were granted exclusive right to publish the RSV for a period of ten years, after which it was to be open to other publishers." An amount said to have been \$100,000 was advanced against royalties and in 1937 "by vote of the ICRE the revision was authorized and the long task begun." As to the composition

of the committee, "not less than three and not more than five of the fifteen members of the Committee were to be chosen with a view to their competence in English literature and their experience in the conduct of public worship or in religious education. Not less than ten or more than twelve were to be chosen for their competence in biblical scholarship." When the NCCCUSA succeeded the Federal Council of Churches in 1950, the ICRE became the Division of Christian Education of NCCCUSA. "The National Council through its Division of Christian Education thus came to sponsor the new translation, and has voted its approval."

Several important facts are to be noted. First, that the RSV is an avowed revision of the ARV of 1901, and not a new translation. Second, that had the copyright to the 1901 version been turned over to any other agency which subsequently became incorporated into NCCCUSA, it undoubtedly would have received similar "authorization." It should also be remembered in this connection, that the majority of the Lutheran bodies in America are not members of the NCCCUSA and were not represented on the ICRE. Third, that the statement covering the make-up of the Committee is exceedingly ambiguous, with the result that there was no scholar on the Committee whose field was liturgical worship. Fourth, that the dominant spirit of the entire project from its inception has been that of religious education rather than corporate worship. This was later highlighted when the RSV came from the press as the feature of Religious Education Week, 1952.

The Commission, whose concern is worship in a liturgical church, feels that there is a certain incompatibility at this point. The purpose of the stated Epistles and Gospels in The Service is not simply a matter of religious education. It is not the same as instruction in the classroom. The purpose of the liturgy is to facilitate the meeting of God and man. It is God-centered, not man-centered, and while no one would argue for an unintelligible service, it is more than a matter of the reason alone. The emotions are important. The use of words which are charged with emotion—in this case filled with past associations both human and divine—may predispose the hearer to a state of receptivity in which the

total apprehension of reality will be greater than that conveyed by other words without such associations, even though such other words may be, in themselves, more precise.

Students of the liturgy know what happened to the Lutheran Epistles and Gospels in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries when some of our ancestors in the faith turned the entire liturgy into a vehicle of Christian education. They preached to the people in collects and hymns. They exhorted and edified without end. The lessons were explained in minute detail so that the most ignorant could not fail to be fully informed with all the necessary resource material. The following is the Epistle for Pentecost from the Brunswick Church Order of 1647, as it was read in The Service:

"When the day of the seven weeks and of Pentecost (to be reckoned from the days of the firstlings, when they began to cut the wheat, which fell on the day after the Passover or the day following, in the very year in which our Lord ascended into heaven) was fully come and it was the fiftieth day after the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, the firstling from the dead, they were all (that is, the apostles, who had again brought their number up to twelve by the election of Matthias, along with others among whom was also Mary the Mother of Jesus) with one accord, following the command of Christ, at this morning hour, in one place. . ."

This was a far cry from the purpose of liturgical worship, and from the purpose of Luther and other early reformers who, while they restored the sermon, also retained the Sacrament and the theocentric orientation of the entire service.

The Commission also feels that the liturgy is a religious art form. It is far more than words, and the whole is more important than any of its parts. It is similar in this respect to the chorale, for instance. The chorale is an art form peculiarly dear to Lutherans because it received its start and achieved its greatest glory within our own Church. It had its golden age in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and experts can trace its metamorphosis into something else and less as the years have passed. It has a stateliness lacking in its predecessor—the medieval carol; an austerity wanting in its successor—the Victorian hymn tune; a con-

gregational participation that plainsong never knew. Its harmonies are vigorous and manly, its pace slow and steady, its impact tremendous. But it is sixteenth or seventeenth century—it does not speak the language of the day of Honegger and Mahler and Shostakovitch. It follows traditional patterns, while our young people are being raised on a diet of Gershwin. It may have spoken well enough 400 years ago, but it doesn't speak the language of the twentieth century. Today we know more about music than Hassler, Luther, Gerhardt and Mueller. Music itself has changed. We need atonality, chords of the 9th and 11th, and 5/4 time to put the chorales into living musical language so that they can speak to our young people!

Now no sane person would think of revising the chorales along such lines. We want "Ein feste Burg" and "Wie schön leuchtet" to remain as they were because they were an honest product of their own age—a true and abiding art form. Yet we propose to throw out the AV, which is of a piece with all the rest of our liturgical language—the reason, in fact, for our liturgical language, for the language of the liturgy has usually come from the language of scripture and not vice versa. The liturgy—including the Epistles and Gospels, which are part of it—is of one piece, and that one piece is a religious art form—the genuine, honest and abiding product of one age.

It is at just this point that the RSV falls down. It is not the AV. Neither is it a new translation of the Scriptures into twentieth century English. It is not a genuine product of its own age. As one reads articles by two of the translators, Dr. Walter Russell Bowie (*Atlantic Monthly*, August, 1946) and Dr. Henry J. Cadbury (*The Christian Century*, February 5, 1947), one can detect a certain wistfulness that the translators were, by nature of the circumstances of copyright and protection of the text, forced to revise the ARV of 1901 rather than prepare a real new modern version of the Bible. And Dr. Amos N. Wilder (*Atlantic Monthly*, December, 1946) writes:

"We must be sure that we have a really superlative new version before we relinquish the old. . . . It may be that the present revision, along with

many private translations of our time, are only the first phases in the production of a modern version that will impose its excellence for centuries to come. . . . The King James Version admits us to the reality of a timeless culture and a historic church. . . . Church bodies, pastors and educators will have difficult decisions to make. They will be well advised for the time being to use both this version and the King James Version taking careful account of the occasion and purpose in view."

And at a recent meeting of Lutheran university students in Cambridge, Mass., Dr. Cadbury, one of the translators, in answer to a direct question about the use of the RSV for the printed text of the Epistles and Gospels in the new Service Book, expressed a similar counsel of caution.

With this advice, the Commission agrees. It is aware, after consulting newspaper and magazine files for the 1880's and 1900's, that the advent of both the English Revised Version of 1881 and the American Revised Version of 1901 was heralded in much the same manner as that of the RSV in 1952. On all three occasions, the bell was tolled loud and long for the AV. The same arguments appeared in behalf of the new texts; 800,000 copies of the ERV were sold on the first day—a considerably better showing than the RSV considering the difference in the English-speaking population of the world between 1881 and 1952. Two days later, on May 22, 1881, two Chicago papers, the "Tribune" and the "Times," printed the entire text of the New Testament in the ERV. The Common Service, which appeared in 1888, continued to use the AV. The General Council, General Synod, and United Synod South did not overrule the judgment of the Committee. The ERV gave way to the ARV of 1901, and the ARV was foredoomed by the one line, "Jehovah is my shepherd." In later years, many who had greeted the new versions with enthusiasm were happy that the Committee had not been moved.

To be sure, the committee which prepared the Common Service in 1888 did not have to reckon with determined and well-financed professional emotion. *The Lutheran* (September 17, 1952) tells us:

"Copywriters of America's famous advertising agency—Batten, Barton, Durstine and Osborn—had been at work telling the American people about

the Bible this month. Their campaign centers around the new translation, the Revised Standard Version, to be published September 30. Thomas Nelson and Sons, New York firm which has a 10-year contract for exclusive right to publish the RSV, states that it is spending \$500,000 to advertise the new translation."

Of this effort, the editor of *Church Management* (September, 1952) says:

"The RSV of the Bible is a great work and will have a well-deserved sale. But we refuse to buy the proposition of the young man in the office of Batten, Barton, Durstine and Osborn, the agency which is placing the advertising, which was offered to us in a recent visit. It seems that an advertising budget of \$250,000 has been set up to properly publicize the sale during the remainder of 1952. 'That is a quarter of a million dollars,' explained the advertising executive. 'After we have spent that you may be assured that nobody in the United States will remember that there was a King James Version of the Bible.'"

Concludes the editor: "There will be thousands of clergymen who will buy the new, scholarly revision who will still prefer the King James Version . . . for public reading in the house of God. Check it and write us in five years."

The Commission believes that the true worth of any version of Holy Scripture is not measured by promotional effort, but by its own intrinsic merit. This is often neither quickly or readily apparent. The RSV will find its true place among the English versions of the Bible in the next few decades. The accumulated experience of devout Christians will determine whether it will supplant the AV, or whether it will join the company of supplementary texts. The Commission believes that this process cannot be hastened without widespread dissatisfaction and regret. It further believes that it would be highly unwise to give premature approval to the liturgical use of a version of the Bible—however fine—of which the church and its people have not yet had the opportunity to measure the full stature.

It is still too early to evaluate fairly the accuracy of the RSV on doctrinal grounds. We still await a complete analysis by com-

petent scholars. It does appear, however, that at least two decisions made in the preparation of the RSV have played into the hands of doctrinal critics. One was the failure to adopt some method, similar to the italics in the text of the AV, of indicating words wanting in the original text but supplied by the translators; the other was the decision to use "thee," etc., for God, but not for our Lord. These factors, however, did not influence the stand of the Commission.

Frederick William Faber, writing after his conversion to Rome, said:

"Who will say that the uncommon beauty and marvelous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the greatest strongholds of heresy? It lives on the ear like a music that can never be forgotten, like the sound of church bells, which the convert scarcely knows how he can forego. Its felicities seem often to be almost things rather than words."

Faber's point is one often completely overlooked by those who call the language of the AV dead. If that were true, someone neglected to tell Laurence Olivier, producer of two of the greatest money-making films of all time—both in Elizabethan English. And some of our poets, like T. S. Eliot, are happily (and profitably) unaware that no one understands verbs that end in *-eth* and *-est*. Sense and meaning is conveyed in ways other than simply the literal meaning of words—by context, totality, rhythm, color, inflection and expression. A great deal of the dissatisfaction with the AV in liturgical use, and especially in the Epistles and Gospels, is due to lack of preparation on the part of the reader and subsequent sloppy performance. Sir Laurence and his cast did not go into production cold. They studied their lines and knew their pronunciation and meaning. The Commission does not believe that the language of the AV, when it is properly read, has lost its meaning.

The Commission does not believe that the language of the AV has lost its meaning for modern man except to the extent that the church and its program of religious education have failed. Our young people of today understand and use a scientific vocabulary their elders never had—and this is only one of the many

familiar and specialized vocabularies within the English language. We have military and naval English, educational and scientific English, sociological and medical English, legal and business English, officialese and gobbledygook. An outsider is not expected to know these vocabularies, but the insider does know them, uses them with complete familiarity and would be quite lost without them. The language of the AV is the specialized language of the English-speaking part of Christendom. The initiated know it, use it, understand it, and would be quite lost without it. They know that "prevent" in a psalm does not mean to stop somebody from doing something, that "all" in "drink ye all of it" does not mean to drain the chalice, and that "charity" in I Corinthians 13 does not mean a hand-out. Wise pastors, teachers and parents have trained them, and such matters are part of their religious knowledge. If this is not the case, then it is an indictment of our educational processes and techniques. If it is true that there is very little biblical knowledge left in our culture today, it is also true that what little there is is in the language of the AV. The Commission does not desire to be a party to uprooting it until it can be replaced with something quite clearly better.

In the study of this question, the Commission has accumulated vast amounts of material from many sources, from which the foregoing has been culled. Whether one agrees with the stand of the Commission or not, it should at least be evident that its position was not taken in snap judgment, nor was the question settled *a priori* by closed minds. The Commission has not been, and is not now, willing to exclude the RSV, for only by its experimental use can its real worth be estimated. Nor is the Commission willing at this time to adopt it as the printed text for the Epistles and Gospels in the official liturgy of the Lutheran Church of America. To adopt either the AV or the RSV would be to disappoint and perhaps offend half the church. We much prefer to print no lessons, and to permit our congregations to use whichever text they wish, and to place in the hands of the people an inexpensive lectionary. Should the RSV prove to be what its advocates believe, some future date will see it printed in the official book. Should it not

prove so, the church will be spared the embarrassment of appearing to have been swept off its feet.

LUTHER REED

EDWARD HORN

GEORGE SELTZER

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

H. A. PREUS

S. F. SALZMANN

Book Reviews and Notices¹

Criticism and Faith. By John Knox. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952. 128 pages. \$1.75.

In a very thought-provoking series of six concise chapters the author seeks to analyze the role of biblical scholarship in the life of the church. No one could seriously question his competence to deal with the subject. For many years he has been engaged in biblical, and especially New Testament, study, research, and teaching. Following service at Emory, Fisk, Hartford, and the University of Chicago, he has been professor of sacred literature in Union Theological Seminary since 1943. Several significant volumes have come from his pen and have won for him wide recognition as a creative thinker.

It was while working on the editorial staff of *The Interpreter's Bible*, to which he has already made no small contribution, that he came face to face with the arresting problem of the relation of exegesis to preaching in our day. The experience suggested to his mind the thought of seeking to analyze the place which biblical scholarship has held in the thinking of common people in the congregations and to note both its failures and its contributions. His thesis embraces six scintillating chapters.

Chapter I deals with "Historical Criticism: Welcomed or Forced on Us?" After calling attention to the indifference of Eastern Orthodoxy and the antipathy of Roman Catholicism toward the historical method, Dr. Knox discusses the situation relative to the Anglican and Protestant responses. He observes that there is a wide gap between the seminaries and graduate schools on the one hand and the congregations on the other. In the one area men have dealt with biblical criticism and have appreciated its values; in

the other, they have passed it by. No small part of the problem inheres in educational technique. The results of criticism welcomed in the seminary have not carried the confidence of the congregation.

Another aspect of this common distrust of criticism, Dr. Knox observes, lies in the religious irrelevance of much biblical research. Critics are wont to become fascinated with the problems of documents, texts, dates, sources, and literary structures and to neglect to show a proper appreciation of their relation to religion and life. The result has been the loss of the sense of certainty which men crave in their religious experience. How to make clear the freedom of faith from any threat of historical criticism is a real task.

In his second chapter on "The Security of Faith" Dr. Knox points out how historical criticism has opened up the Scriptures to fresh insights and interpretations which have given greater clarity and confidence in the church as a continuing community. The experience of the early Christian community centered in an event in history, the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. Through the operation of the Spirit in relation to this event the Christian community was created. This is to affirm the historicity of the basic evidences of faith and to justify the application of the historical method in their analysis. Faith, however, does not require the verdict of the historian to certify the event. The experience of the Christian community presupposes the reality of the event without question as to historical occurrence. The fact is implicit in the life of the church. Again, the historian is not needed to interpret the significance of the

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

event. Faith lays hold on redemption apart from the historical method. Millions have accepted Christ by faith with little or no knowledge of the techniques of criticism. But when one asks the question as to the historical evidences associated with the event, one enters the realm of the historian and needs his assistance in determining details. Faith itself cannot answer problems of dates, authorship, and literary structure. Nevertheless, it has its place in understanding even the historicity of Jesus, for what we have in the Gospels is not pure objective history but the account of Jesus as he was remembered and interpreted. Faith and history thus join hands in the common understanding of Jesus. The two cannot properly be separated. Yet faith is primary. The basis of the resurrection is not so much documentary as it is experiential. The fact is indisputable regardless of the historian's version.

Herein lies the element of distrust in the historical method. At times the historian has presumed to provide the final answer to an inquiry, whereas the inquiry itself may involve matters which are purely experiential rather than historically observable. The most serious test of the historical method lies in the analysis of the meaning of Christ. According to Dr. Knox, all inquiries as to the self-consciousness of Jesus have historical interest, but the answers have no particular relevance for faith. Even the authenticity of the words of Christ is not dependent on our knowledge of the original utterances of Jesus. Criticism analyzes the materials of the Gospels with an air of objectivity and finds many traditions about Jesus to be at variance with the historical facts. This has caused considerable anxiety in men's minds, but that need not be the case if the relation of criticism to faith is properly understood.

Dr. Knox appeals to criticism to provide a creative interpretation which will give strength and integrity to the historic event to which the Christian community

looks in faith. It is particularly in the matter of preaching that criticism opens up new vistas of biblical and eschatological thought for the enrichment of life in the church. Critic and preacher go together. Both are engaged in the illumination of Scripture.

While the book sets forth numerous points about which there may be wide differences of opinion, it is a work that compels one to think and to test out in thought and experience the validity of its claims. Its aim is a constructive attempt to bring criticism and preaching closer together in their common task.

E. E. FLACK

Plants of the Bible. By Harold N. Moldenke and Alma L. Moldenke. Waltham, Mass.: Chronica Botanica Company, 1952. 384 pages. \$7.50.

This is not a book which many people would want to read straight through, but it is both valuable and interesting for reference. Earlier books on the subject were less comprehensive in scope and were based on less thorough scientific research. This will undoubtedly be the standard work in the field for a long time. Its large pages are filled with the results of a tremendous amount of painstaking work to gather information and study controversial problems; the bibliography lists more than 600 books and articles.

Just about everything that one might want to know about any plant mentioned in the Bible, or plant product, can be found here; e.g., the sycamore tree (Zaccheus and Amos), the rose of Sharon, the balm in Gilead, Leah's mandrakes, various lilies, gopher wood, the "shewbread" of the Temple, wine, substances used for tanning leather, papyrus, thorns, tares, etc. Of special interest is the treatment of manna, showing that three distinct types of substance are so designated.

Scientific botanical information, including the technical Latin names, is given about the various trees and plants, and also some details about their uses in

everyday life. The Bible passages in which they are mentioned are printed in full, and often some explanatory notes are given about the significance or use of the plant as there presented. There are more than 100 illustrations.

Careful attention is devoted to discriminating between various plants that are, or are often supposed to be, similar or identical. Oriental plants are distinguished from Western plants with which they are sometimes confused. Attention is given to the exact meanings of the original Greek and Hebrew words, and to the various translations of them in several English versions. Differences of opinion among scholars about the identity of plants are recorded, with the author's conclusions clearly shown.

Very complete indexes of words and of Scripture passages are given. Use of the book for reference could have been made much easier if the major treatment of a word had been indicated in the index by some such device as heavy type; e.g., 15 different articles are referred to under "oak," and 20 under "myrrh."

The chief author is curator of the Herbarium, New York Botanical Garden, and a member of the graduate faculty of Columbia University. He is a Lutheran, a graduate of Susquehanna University and of Columbia University. His wife collaborated with him on this book, as on some of his other voluminous writings.

HAROLD L. CREAGER

The Interpreter's Bible. Volume I: General Articles on the Bible, Old Testament Articles, Genesis, Exodus. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952. xxx, 1,099 pages. \$8.75.

Preliminary and auxiliary materials for study of the whole Bible are supplied in the opening section (pp. 1-171) of this first volume of *The Interpreter's Bible*. These go beyond the usual consideration in "General Introduction" of canon and text to include hermeneutical chapters by H. H. Farmer and G. A. Buttrick; the

history of the English version by Allen Wickgren; and the history of Bible interpretation: in the ancient period by R. M. Grant, the medieval and reformation period by J. T. McNeill, and the modern period by Samuel Terrien. There is also a treatment of chronology, metrology, etc., by G. A. Barrois.

The Old Testament articles fill an even more extended section (pp. 174-389), and this introductory matter is topped off by R. H. Pfeiffer's chapters on the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (pp. 390-436). These are the most valuable portions of this volume. They are much more representative than the commentaries on Genesis and Exodus which fill the remaining 660 pages. This reviewer would indeed recommend the purchase and use of Volume I for the sake of its introductory matter alone. As will appear below, he cannot approve the work done on Genesis and Exodus or commend it to students and pastors. There are much better commentaries available on these books. But there is no volume of General Introduction to the Bible and the Old Testament to compare with the first part of the present work.

One could wish that more attention had been paid, in the manner of Eissfeldt's Introduction or Bentzen's first volume, to the types of Old Testament literature and their "Sitz im Leben." W. A. Irwin writes of "The Literature of the Old Testament" merely in the manner of a literary historian, sketching the subject. C. A. Simpson does the same for the "Hexateuch." Only in H. E. W. Fosbroke's chapter on "The Prophetic Literature" does anyone pause to consider literary forms. One could also desiderate a specific treatment of the Deuteronomic School of historians. The former prophets are not so much as mentioned in Old Testament articles in so far as these are concerned with the groups of Old Testament books or the types of Old Testament literature.

On the other hand, the coverage of the

articles on "The Old Testament World" by W. F. Albright, the "History of Israel" by T. H. Robinson, "The History of the Religion of Israel" by James Muelenburg, and "The Faith of Israel" by G. Ernest Wright, grouped appropriately under the heading, "The Meaning and Significance of the Old Testament," is most admirable. Here in about 160 pages are first rate summaries of present-day interest in the Old Testament from the angles of archaeology, history, *Religionsgeschichte*, and theology. The last two of them appeal to the present reviewer as especially sound and well written. One also expects, and always receives, illumination from W. F. Albright. On the other hand, T. H. Robinson is not a very good team-mate in this group. His outmoded chronology is an embarrassment from which this volume will never recover.

So far so good. But by *exegesis* and *exposition* the editors of *The Interpreter's Bible* and of Genesis and Exodus in particular apparently understand something utterly unrelated to the accepted meaning of these terms. This volume has practically nothing of either. Exegesis is squeezed out of the comments on Genesis by C. A. Simpson's wholesale importation of his own peculiar source theories. This he ought not to have perpetrated in a volume of cooperative scholarship. But granting that some analysis of documents is necessary, e.g., in Genesis 1, 2, one still has a right to know what the *image of God* means at 2:26 f. But all Simpson tells us is that "after our likeness" is probably a gloss on "in our image." The phrases appear again at 5:3; but Simpson has no comment here. Is one a gloss on the other here, too? If not, how can it be so in the first instance? This is shoddy exegesis. It occurs time and again. The student had better read the Cambridge Bible or Westminster or even the little New Century Bible on Genesis. He will learn nothing from Simpson, who has taken half of every page on Genesis to repeat, in part, what he has written else-

where in a learned work with which the best Old Testament scholars at home and abroad are not satisfied. It is just too bad.

Does Rylarsdaam do better in Exodus? His source analysis at least is more normal. Compare Exodus 3 and 6 in this regard. But what as to the meaning of words on which the ultimate interpretation of a text must rest? At 6:3 Shaddai (EV *Almighty*) is discussed. This is more than Simpson attempts: see at Genesis 4:26 where the whole discussion of the initial occurrence of "the name of Yahwe" revolves simply about source analysis. But the discussion at Exodus 6:3 is surely scrambled. He believes *Shaddai* originally meant "Almighty" and makes no reference to Albright's interpretation of it as "the One of the mountain" in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* as long ago as 1935. He apparently derives it from *shadhedh*, the root of *Shodh*, "destruction," in accordance with Joel 1:15, where "like destruction from Shaddai" is merely a play on sound, similar to "Woman, for from man" in Genesis 2:23. He wrongly cites Deuteronomy 32:17 for an occurrence of the term. There we have another word. So the yield is zero. The reader is urged to contrast the criticisms here voiced of the lack of exegesis in Genesis and the faulty exegesis in Exodus with what is written on page xviii about the exegesis on the working page of this commentary. *The Interpreter's Bible* fails to fulfill its promise and intention. Genesis and Exodus, at least, are not well done.

Of exposition we shall not say much. Homiletics rather than exegetes are served here. But back on page xviii the expectation is aroused that interpretation will be based on exegesis. It is perhaps not the fault of Drs. Bowie and Parks if this is not done in Genesis and Exodus. They had not much to work on.

It is to be fervently hoped that forthcoming Old Testament volumes of *The Interpreter's Bible* will improve on the exegetical work done in Volume I.

CHARLES M. COOPER

The Bible for Boys and Girls. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. 576 pages, 1952. \$3.50.

Selections from the King James version are attractively presented for the use of children in schools and homes. Verse divisions are not indicated in the text, which is printed in paragraph form. There are 31 full-page color illustrations and eight maps. A brief glossary is appended to define such terms as have changed their meaning in the course of centuries: e.g., borrow, flood, instantly, etc. The selections themselves are well chosen and will be found to parallel the material usually treated in Bible Histories. This is an American imprint edition of a book published by Thomas Nelson in Edinburgh with special license (because not a privileged press and therefore not permitted to print the authorized text) from Queen Elizabeth II.

God Spoke by Moses. By Oswald T. Allis. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1951. 159 pages. \$2.00.

The author of this book worked in the same general area when he wrote *The Five Books of Moses*, in which work he dealt with the critical issues of authorship and source analysis almost exclusively.

In the present work he leaves critical issues aside, for the most part, and concerns himself with the subject matter of the Pentateuch and its interpretation. He gives the message of these first five books, pointing it up in a very helpful way, drawing the attention of the student to all those things that the beginner in particular would like to see explained. Though not a formal commentary, this work gives much helpful interpretation, concisely put, and in an approach that is entirely conservative.

H. C. LEUPOLD

Der Begriff "Rhema" im Biblisch-Griechischen: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und semologische Untersuchung (I. "Rhema" in der Septuagint.). By Eero Repo. Helsinki: Finnish Academy of Sciences, 1951. 205 pages.

New Testament scholars and biblical theologians generally will welcome this learned dissertation on the concept of the Word in the Greek Old and New Testaments. This first part of the work concerns only the Septuagint. The New Testament section is to follow.

The author limits his consideration primarily to the occurrences of *rhema* as a synonym of *logos*. He points out that the former term occurs with surprising frequency in biblical as compared with non-biblical writers in Greek from the fourth century B. C. to the third Christian century. He finds that *rhema* is gradually displaced by *logos* as the Septuagint rendering of *Word*, as is also the case in general Greek usage. This fact supports the contention that the Greek Old and New Testaments are not in a special "biblical Greek," isolated from the spoken language of their times. But the relatively more frequent usage of *rhema* in the Septuagint is chiefly due to the literary character of this Bible translation. The earlier portions of it especially reflect its Semitic originals and at the same time the Jewish-Aramaic speech of its makers.

There are also, Repo reports, special nuances to some instances of *rhema* which at times distinguish it from the generally synonymous *logos*. It is a more complex and a more concrete concept than *logos*. It emphasizes the actual, "here and now" relation of the hearer of God's Word, and thus represents the Old Testament and Jewish conception of the Word as over against the Greek and Hellenistic. This feature will be of particular importance as the author develops his future researches in the New Testament usage of the term.

CHARLES M. COOPER

Primitive Gospel Sources. By P. B. W. Stather Hunt. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. 344 pages. \$6.00.

This work deals with the problem of the primitive Christian faith and mission in relation to the Old Testament. In suggesting the solution to it, the author gives an account of the genesis of the Christian religion, and for this reason entitles his book "Primitive Gospel Sources."

The author makes a claim neither for new evidence nor for a fresh theory of the origins of the Gospel. He seeks to interpret the generally assumed facts with special reference to the work of Rendel Harris, who proposed in his *Testimonia* the thesis for the existence of a testimony-literature composed of a selection of the Messianic passages from the Old Testament designed to persuade the Jews of the truth of the Gospel of Christ. His basic starting point in his own words is this: ". . . Dr. Harris has proved his case. What has rather surprised me is that he did not carry it a step further and examine the influence of the early testimony writings upon the *composition* of the Gospels" (p. viii).

Since this work is occupied with the genesis of the Christian faith in its relation to the Old Testament, the questions of the derivation of Q, M, and L remains of secondary importance. The author seeks to explain a phenomenon which lies behind all the supposed primitive documents, namely the "testimony-complex." He constructs his argument as follows: The first Christian preachers were chiefly concerned with the task of proving that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, and that in every respect he corresponded perfectly with the figure of the Messiah as set forth in the Old Testament and the Jewish tradition. In their preaching in the early years the preachers could appeal to the knowledge of the hearers themselves, but later, in the Hellenistic world, it became necessary to state the facts of Jesus' life with exactitude and show how he had fulfilled the Messianic

prophecies. In this way, on the Gentile mission field, there grew a literature of the episodes in the life of Jesus which provided materials for the production of the Gospels. This episodic pre-Gospel testimony literature helps to explain the variations and the discrepancies in the later Gospel accounts. The real problem lies in the question of how much the Gospels owe to this primitive, formative process. And there is evidence in the Epistles and in the writings of the Fathers to show the existence of a testimony or "proof-text" literature belonging to the pre-Gospel period. Jesus himself employed the testimony argument by saying, "Now the prophecy is fulfilled." The Gospels stand in an inextricable relation to the Old Testament; in fact there is little in the contents which is not related in some way to the Old Testament. For example, note the testimony basis provided by Isaiah, "the eyes of the blind shall be opened," in the miracles of Jesus. "The stories of such healings were gathered together long before there was any written Gospel, in order to give the answer which this question demanded" (Was this prophecy fulfilled, and if so, when?). Their interest lay not in the fact that they were accounts of miracles, but in the stories as marks of the Messiah, as proofs that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. The Gospels were written not to record history or to gather stories, but to show how completely the incidents in the life of Jesus correspond to the pattern laid down in detail by the prophets. To fail to recognize the testimony basis of the Gospels is "to be like the explorer who mistakes the distant spray from the Victoria Falls for the smoke of a prairie fire."

This book aims to present a different point of view from that usually taken toward the Gospels. "Whether its conclusions are right or wrong, such an attitude will always show unexpected features in the picture before us." This is the concluding thought of the introduction. This much, but only this much, can be granted to the author. Yet, to say this is

to pay tribute to him for calling attention in an arresting manner to the extremely difficult problem of relating the Old Testament with the thought and life of the early church. This book, with its closely knit argumentation and remarkable documentation from the literature surrounding the New Testament, is highly rewarding reading.

As to the thesis itself, the reviewer was led to this conclusion: "Here is a bridge too narrow and too fragile to bear so heavy and so complex a traffic" as the problem of the origins of the New Testament presents to us. Its presupposition belongs to an age of scholarship now becoming obsolete, namely, the assumption that on literary-historical grounds it is possible to give an adequate explanation of the genesis of a literature. There is neither a sufficiently deep grasp of the spiritual motivation in the production of the Gospels nor of the social and cultural factors in the total situation from which they emerge. For this reason there hangs over this excellent work of scholarship an aura of unreality.

JACOB W. HEIKKINEN

Commentary on St. Paul's Letter to the Ephesians. By George Stoeckhardt. Translated from the German by Martin S. Sommer. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1952. 265 pages. \$4.50.

In his introduction the author presents the theories and opinions of those scholars who question or dispute the Pauline authorship of this letter. He concludes that tradition, testimony of the Fathers, and internal testimony support the Pauline authorship, and he presents logical reasons for that conclusion. In like manner he discusses the question to whom the Epistle is addressed and concludes that it was addressed to the church in Ephesus. He expresses the opinion that the letter was written from Rome during the imprisonment, probably about A.D. 62.

Special reason for the writing of the letter is not found. The first chapters,

1-3, are dogmatic and the remainder paraneitic. The special theme dominating both sections is the church.

The largest portion of the commentary is devoted to a discussion of 1:3-14. After introducing the doxology, which begins this portion of the letter, the author enters upon an exegesis designed to show that the divine election of those who attain salvation is unto faith and not in view of faith, and that those who hold the latter view are synergists. There is included an "Excursus Concerning the Doctrine of the Election of Grace according to Ephesians 1:3-14." We quote a few passages which indicate the trend and nature of the argument. "The word *hemas* points to definite single persons, to single Christians" (p. 44). Election is not at all an abstract or theoretical counsel of God which then later on receives its concrete content in certain individuals, but from the very first refers to a certain fixed number of individuals. . . . Certain persons, one by one, were elected" (pp. 44, 45). "The eternal election of God according to its very conception and essence is not a demonstration of the omniscience of God, but an eternal act of God, an act of His will, an act of His counsel concerning certain persons" (p. 47). "God in His eternal counsel and determination decided to bestow faith upon certain persons, those who are now Christian, and also upon myself, who am a Christian" (p. 48). "By the election of grace single individuals were chosen" (p. 91). "From the very beginning God has determined the number, the complete and exact number of the elect, . . . and therefore not a single one of these can perish" (p. 92). "God sees to it that these persons whom He has chosen from eternity are brought in time to hear the Word of God. He sees to it that the Gospel is preached to them, through this Gospel He brings them to faith, graciously He justifies them through Christ" (pp. 94, 95).

The author claims that this line of reasoning is the only one which will accord

with the Lutheran Confessions, notably Art. XI of the Formula of Concord, as well as the only possible exegesis of scriptural statements in re this subject. Some others who bear the name Lutheran do not agree with him. An effort to enter the mind of God and set forth an interpretation of his mysteries categorically and dogmatically is fraught with danger of misstatement. The Confessions of the Lutheran Church repudiate synergism.

But if by an eternal act of God I have been forcibly drawn into his kingdom and am unable to escape therefrom (shall we say held in protective custody?), then I have no freedom of will to reject the Gospel. In a sense I have become a spiritual robot. It is extremely difficult for us, finite creatures, held in the coils of time, to free ourselves from introducing ideas of time into our meditations upon eternity, to realize that

"Nothing to Him is present, nothing past,
But an eternal now doth last."

If it is permissible to speak of an antecedent will of God and a consequent will in eternity, then certainly his will to save mankind by providing propitiation for sin would be antecedent to his foreknowledge of the elect for whom that propitiation becomes effective in Christ. Or shall we say that provision of salvation, foreknowledge, and election are coincidental? Neither of these would make election an arbitrary act or make man the arbiter of his own salvation. Here we have a holy mystery, incomprehensible in some of its features, which transcends our finite knowledge and cannot be explained clearly by our theologians or by reference to our Confessions.

1:15-23: "Paul's Intercession" is summarized in Paul's prayer that Christians may be led into a profound understanding of the glory of the inheritance reserved for them.

2:1-10: "A Reminder" in which Christian readers are invited to consider their past condition and the great change and transformation experienced by them when they who were pagans or Jews became

Christians. There is an excursus on this "Doctrine of Conversion." Man has been rescued through conversion from a state of utter corruption. In his state of spiritual death there remained in fallen man nothing of spiritual ability, activity, or spiritual power. "All teaching and preaching is lost upon him until he is enlightened, converted and regenerated by the Holy Ghost."

2:11-22: "Another Reminder," parallel to that which has just preceded. The Gentiles are in every respect as favorably situated as the circumcision, are no longer strangers to the kingdom, but have peace as living members of the church of Christ.

3:1-13: "Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles." Paul returns thanks that he has the privilege, by the grace of God, of preaching the Gospel to them and has been able to gather a church among them in whom the saving work of God has been wrought; and he asks that they be not discouraged by reason of his suffering.

3:14-21: "Another Apostolic Intercession." A prayer that the Ephesian Christians may ever grow in faith and in understanding of the ecumenical character of the church.

4:1-6: The author graphically portrays the *Una Sancta*.

4:17-5:21: "General Admonitions." Christians should walk before God, holy and unblamable in love, resist and thwart the old Adam, keep themselves unspotted from the world, while it is their duty to reprove, improve, and win the children of this world.

5:22-6:9: "Tables of Duties." Christian members of the household are admonished to be submissive and obedient, affectionate and gentle.

6:10-20: "Closing Admonitions." Steadfastness in the faith, using all the power which God gives through his Word, assure us of victory in battle with the devil.

6:21-24: "Conclusion and Blessing." That grace which carries with it eternal life is to be with all who love the Lord Jesus sincerely.

On the whole, a scholarly, warm-

hearted, Christocentric exposition. A valuable addition to New Testament commentaries.

JOHN HALL

The Gospel of Mark. By Frederick C. Grant. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. 72 pages. 75 cents.

This booklet is the seventh issue in the *Harper's Annotated Bible Series*, which projects the Scriptures in the King James Version with fresh, concise introductions and critical notes. The author of this issue has brought to his study a wealth of New Testament research and publication, including a large work on Mark entitled *The Earliest Gospel* (1943). As an approach to the interpretation of the book he provides three brief general introductions: to the New Testament, the Gospels, and Mark. He views Mark as the record of the early Christian tradition as presented to the persecuted church of Rome in the late 60's, shortly after the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul. He interprets Mark not as setting forth a purely human Jesus, in keeping with the popular position of liberal thought a generation ago, but as proclaiming the strong Son of God, who by mighty works introduced the reign of God over the world and in his death and resurrection achieved victory.

Pastors, teachers, and students of the Gospel will find this concise, scholarly commentary full of instruction and helpful suggestions.

E. E. FLACK

The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology. By Edward A. Dowey, Jr. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952. 261 pages. \$3.75.

Both in the Lutheran and in the Reformed Churches many theologians have in recent times reached back to the theology of the great Reformers. Lutheranism has had its "Luther renaissance," and Calvinism its "Calvin renaissance," both in recent decades. In America a fruit of

the renewed interest in Calvin has been the publication of his works in English: both his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* and his commentaries have found numerous interested students. In the Lutheran Church the renewed interest in Luther has grown tremendously after World War II; we are, however, far behind the Reformed in publishing and studying the books of Luther, at least here in America, but a publication of more works of Luther is under consideration.

Having done some work in Luther but none in Calvin, I started to read Dowey's book with certain preconceived notions in my mind. I had the rather common view on Calvin that is largely based on the studies of men like Julius Köstlin, Reinhold Seeberg, Gustaf Aulén, etc. In reading Dowey's book I had the bitter-sweet experience of realizing that in many decisive points my former views were erroneous. Calvin is closer to Luther than I had thought.

The book contains five main divisions: (1) General characteristics of the knowledge of God, (2) the duplex cognitio Domini, (3) the knowledge of God the Creator, (4) the knowledge of God the Redeemer, and (5) the relation between the knowledge of God the Creator and the knowledge of God the Redeemer.

Calvin teaches a general revelation of God in the works of creation and in conscience, but he emphasizes that "faith is not conceived by the bare beholding of heaven but by the hearing of the Word. Whence it follows that men cannot be led to a saving knowledge of God except by the direction of the Word. And yet this does not prevent but that they may be made inexcusable without the Word, who although they be naturally deprived of light, are yet blind through their own malice, as Paul teaches in the first chapter of Romans." Calvin's teaching is here practically identical with that of Luther.

Both Luther and Calvin believe in the Bible as the divinely inspired record of revelation. But while Luther is content

simply to believe, as the Scriptures themselves state, that they were written by holy men of God as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, Calvin developed a dictation theory of inspiration. Dowey seems to have little sympathy with this theory, but he points out that Calvin believed in the dictation of the original manuscripts only. He was quite critical of the Vulgate version, and in his exegesis he in general used sound common sense in spite of his dictation theory. Both Luther and Calvin found Christ and not the book as the center and object of faith. Both of them believed that the Holy Spirit works faith only through the Word, not through a direct inward influence, as the "Spiritualists" believed.

Dowey discusses, only briefly, Calvin's teaching of the means of grace, and as far as he goes there seems to be a general agreement between Calvin and Luther. In dealing with the relations between the two Reformers we usually pay attention to their differences in certain details, not to their general and basic agreements.

We are accustomed to think that one of the main differences between Luther and Calvin is in the fact that Calvin places his doctrine of predestination in the doctrine of God, at the beginning of his treatment of the Christian doctrine, whereas Luther puts it toward the end of soteriology; thus, Calvin starts with a speculation of the eternal decree of God, whereas Luther starts with Christ and approaches the doctrine of election from him. Dowey points out that this is not true of the final edition of Calvin's *Institutes* (1559), which shows his final stand. The doctrine of predestination is in this edition at the end of *ordo salutis*, having the same place as Luther wants it to have. Like Luther, Calvin emphasizes that we should never start with this doctrine but with repentance and faith in Christ, for only in and through him can this doctrine be understood. In Calvin's practical teaching of Christianity this doctrine has little significance, for the Christian must treat

all men as potentially elected. There is hardly any real difference here between Calvin and Luther. This is something new to me. Dowey points out that the later Calvinistic orthodoxy put the doctrine of predestination to the beginning and gave it a more dominating place than it had in Calvin's theology. In the Lutheran Church the development went in an opposite direction: Lutheran orthodoxy modified Luther's teaching of predestination and gave it a place more in the background than it had in Luther. Thus, the later development in both churches led them in this respect farther from each other than they were originally.

It may be said that there is difference between the two Reformers in one thing: Calvin teaches the supralapsarian view of a double predestination, while Luther teaches an infralapsarian double predestination. It can, however, hardly be denied that in his book, *The Bondage of the Will*, Luther comes pretty close to the supralapsarian view—perhaps not quite stepping over the boundary line.

Characteristic of Dowey is that he uses abundant quotations from Calvin's works. This has the result that his discussion gives the impression of reliability and faithfulness to the sources. In many cases he takes exception with other students of Calvin, but he seems to prove his point by quotations from Calvin's books. The Calvin whom we find in Dowey's books seems in many respects to be closer to Luther than the Calvin of some other scholars. This shows that the interpretation of Calvin's theology is no easy and simple thing. The same is true of Luther, and therefore both are interpreted in somewhat different ways.

My general impression is that Dr. Dowey has given us a good and generally reliable interpretation of certain central aspects of Calvin's theology. I have enjoyed its reading, and am sure that many others will do the same. It is good for us Lutherans to learn to know what Calvin really teaches. Our experience of being corrected in our former views is after

all more sweet than bitter, and so we become better able to avoid bearing false witness against our neighbor.

UURAS SAARNIVAARA

The Mennonite Church in the Second World War. By Guy F. Hersberger. Scottdale, Pa.: Mennonite Publishing House, 1951. 308 pages. \$3.50.

The professor of History in Goshen College has here presented an illuminating account of the Mennonite Church, commonly designated the (Old) Mennonite Church, in the critical years 1940 to 1945. Although concentrated on the period of World War II, the history inevitably takes into account the situation which preceded the war and some of its consequences. Mennonites, like Quakers and Brethren, members of the "historic peace churches," were severely tested in their faith in non-resistance, and Dr. Hersberger has given a dispassionate and circumstantial account of their dealings with draft boards, their establishment of Civilian Public Service, and public pressures upon them to buy war bonds, work in war industries, and participate in other activities connected with the war. It is pointed out that some Mennonites departed from traditional positions, about 1,300 joining the armed forces and 900 of these completely severing their relations with Mennonitism. Considerable attention is devoted to the ministry of Mennonites to victims of war and to the long-range effects of the war on Mennonites at home and abroad. The book is a valuable addition to the literature of recent church history.

Prairie Shepherd—Lars Paul Esbjorn and the Beginnings of the Augustana Lutheran Church. By Sam Ronnegard. Translated by G. Everett Arden. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1952. 308 pages. \$3.50.

There is inspiration in this volume for the preacher, for the layman, and for

the student of church history. The preacher will gather encouragement from the zeal and patience of the pioneer Swedish pastor who threw in his lot with the masses of Swedish Lutherans who turned their faces to the new world. Esbjörn followed his countrymen across the ocean in order to minister to their spiritual needs on the American frontier. The Lutheran layman will gather new loyalty from the deep devotion and great sacrifice of this pioneer churchman who sought out his scattered sheep like a prairie shepherd and gathered them into the fold of the Lutheran Church. And the student of church history will gather a fund of information about pioneer conditions on the American frontier and a close-up view of a striking personality whom he has known only vaguely, if at all.

It is a thrilling narrative, this story of the Swedish pietistic revivalist and temperance lecturer, accustomed to association with Methodists and Presbyterians, who failed in several trial sermons in Sweden and then came to America's Middle West and became a leader among conservatizing Lutherans. The prairie shepherd was not the first man to be transformed by the conditions of the American frontier. The forces that influenced this development are easily discerned in this account of Esbjörn's career. He was the chief agent in the formation of the Augustana Synod and the establishment of the Augustana Seminary in 1860. Perhaps his greatest service to his church in America was to induce other men, leaders like Hasselquist and greater scholars like Norelius, to come to America and help with the growing flock. Having completed the foundations in America, he returned to Sweden in 1862 and served as a parish pastor there until his death in 1870 at the age of sixty-two.

The painter of this revealing portrait is a pastor in the Church of Sweden and a well-known writer in the religious field.

In addition to the Esbjörn biography he has written a successful novel with both Swedish and American background. The translator, Professor Arden, is head of the department of church history at Augustana Theological Seminary. He has given the English reader of Ronnegard's book a flowing narrative that completely conceals the fact that it is a translation. Students of church history and of general history will be grateful to both of these men for *The Prairie Shepherd*.

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ

What the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church have to Say about Worship and the Sacraments. By Arthur C. Piepkorn. St. Louis: Concordia, 1952. Paper, 41 pages. 25 cents.

At a time when the Lutheran Confessions are praised more than they are used, it is refreshing to come upon a study which reflects some original investigation. The author of this closely printed pamphlet has assembled many of the passages in the Confessions which are related to his subject and has arranged them under a series of theses. Some of the compiler's pet theories, expressed in other places, reappear here. For example, it is asserted that the Lutheran Church is "consciously and determinedly a part of the Catholic Church of the West" (p. 10) and does not feel privileged "to dispense with [its] worship categories and formulations" (p. 11). Although it is of course true that at the time of the Reformation the Lutheran Church stood in the Western liturgical tradition, it is at least doubtful that it stood there "determinedly" or that its doctrine and worship are forever wedded to this tradition. Is it part of this tradition that causes the author to beatify Luther (e.g., p. 7)? Here and there Dr. Piepkorn may find it of advantage to make some changes and additions even if he insists on retaining his "categories and formulations." When, for example, he cites (p. 13) the Apology as stating, "to teach the Gospel is an excellent worship

of God," he weakens the force of the original (*Atqui praeceptus cultus Dei est docere evangelium. Denn der allergrösste, heiligste, nötigste, höchste Gottesdienst . . . ist Gottes Wort predigen*).

Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche. Herausgegeben im Gedenkjahr der Augsburgischen Konfession 1930. 2nd revised edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1952. xlvii, 1,225 pages. DM 26.

The attention of our readers is called to a revised edition of the Book of Concord which was first published in 1930 by a German committee headed by Hans Lietzmann. Except for Lietzmann, who died in 1942, the specialists (Bornkamm, Wolf, Hoppe, and Volz) who worked on the first edition prepared the necessary revisions for the second. These revisions consist in part of an extension of bibliographical references, in part of the use of those volumes of the Weimar edition of Luther's works which have appeared since 1930, in part of the introduction of additional variant readings. The changes are especially important in connection with the Latin and German texts of the Augsburg Confession, and the introduction to this symbol has been entirely rewritten. Significant supplementary material has also been added in the case of the other documents. The result is a definitive critical edition of the Book of Concord in the primary Latin and German texts.

A new English translation of the Book of Concord is now in preparation in America. The translators are taking advantage of this excellent critical text. But it deserves to be emphasized that the Latin and German texts will remain indispensable to the serious student. The *Concordia Triglotta* (with Latin, German, and English texts, published in 1921 by the Concordia Publishing House) is now out of print, and there is no intention of reprinting it. Nor is there any reason for doing so, since the new edition here no-

ticed will supply the need for the Latin and German texts, furnished with elaborate critical apparatuses, in a form which cannot be excelled and at a price which cannot be equalled. It is to be hoped that this new edition of the Latin and German texts will be used alongside of an English translation by many clergymen and students. It is no exaggeration to assert that this is the most important Lutheran book of reference published in this generation.

The typographical excellence of the volume is a marvel of craftsmanship. Despite the technical difficulties involved in publishing such a work, the price has been kept at a minimum (about \$5.00) by subsidies from the Evangelical Church in Germany, the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Germany, and the National Lutheran Council in America, and by the willingness of the publisher to forego all profits.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

Intercommunion. The Report of the Theological Commission appointed by the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order together with a Selection from the Materials presented to the Commission. Edited by Donald Baillie and John Marsh. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. 406 pages. \$4.00.

As its subtitle suggests, this volume is one of the several prepared for the discussions on Faith and Order held at Lund in the summer of 1952. It evidences the concern for the problem of intercommunion which any ecumenical discussion inevitably arouses, as well as the realization that the fellowship of the Lord's table involves a degree of intimacy that does not yet exist between all the churches involved in those discussions.

This dual realization comes out in the report of the theological commission: "The existing disunity of the Church reaches its most painful point at the Lord's Table, when members of different

Churches cannot meet together to celebrate and receive Holy Communion" (p. 41). "We are not all agreed as regards the measure of intercommunion which may precede and anticipate fuller union of the Churches . . . [nor] as to the requisite basis of intercommunion, and therefore we are not agreed as to what may justifiably be regarded as an obstacle in principle to intercommunion" (pp. 42-43).

The Lutheran Church in America, by and large, has not yet confronted this issue in an acute form. Except for provisional arrangements in connection with our ministry to the armed forces, the Lutheran bodies in this country have given little attention even to the theological and practical problems involved in joint Lutheran participation in the sacrament. It is this reviewer's impression that on the community level there is more such attention, but that comparatively little of it is theologically informed.

For both groups—those who are not aware of the problem and those who approach the problem sentimentally—the present volume should prove worthwhile. Lutherans will be aroused by much that is in it. Wilhelm Niesel, an authority on Calvin, has subjected the Lutheran view of communion and intercommunion to careful and critical scrutiny (pp. 281-289), and Edmund Schlöcker's presentation (pp. 296-302) of a Lutheran view criticizes "an excessive dogmatism which is without foundation in the institution of the Lord's Supper, . . . whereas faith receives the mystery with longing expectancy, doctrine assumes sovereignty over the mystery" (p. 301). This from the author of a ponderous tome on the theology of the Lutheran Confessions!

It will also be valuable for Lutherans to learn the theological concerns that animate the advocates of open communion and intercommunion, and for Lutheran "ivory-tower" theologians to learn the facts of life about "Existing Rules and Customs of the Churches" (pp. 361-387; especially pp.

374-376 on Lutheranism). It will be salutary for Lutherans to be told why Anglicans and Orthodox regard Lutheran ordination as an obstacle to intercommunion.

Any American Lutheran who supposes that the Galesburg Rule or any other rule covers all instances should read this book. As our churches take an increasing role in the ecumenical endeavor, they will face this question with increasing urgency. The volume on *Intercommunion* will prove to be an indispensable source-book for years to come.

JAROSLAV J. PELIKAN

The Christian Dilemma: Catholic Church-Reformation. By W. H. van de Pol. Translated by G. van Hall. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. 299 pages. \$4.75.

The author of this book was active in the ecumenical movement, was later converted to Roman Catholicism, and is now professor of the Phenomenology of Protestantism in the Catholic University of Nijmegen, Holland. When the book, which was translated from the Dutch, compares the Catholic Church with the Reformation it means by the latter term especially, but not exclusively, the Reformed Protestantism with which the author is best acquainted. The career and varied experiences of Professor van de Pol enable him to write with more knowledge of and sympathy with Protestantism than we usually encounter in a Roman Catholic writer, but he nevertheless takes his stand squarely, if irenically, on the teachings and practices of the church to which he now belongs.

The dilemma which the author discusses is the division of Christendom into two camps, "Catholic Church and Reformation." Related to the former, as schismatics, are the Eastern Orthodox and Old Catholics. Related to the latter, in addition to Calvinists, are Lutherans, various types of Anglicans (despite the bishop of Gloucester's recent assertion that "there are no differences whatsoever" between

Anglicans and Roman Catholics, p. 196), and a host of sects. The author deplors the division and believes that Christendom is nearer to a healing of schisms than it has been for four centuries. Differences must be resolved by breaking down psychological barriers (mutual hostility, prejudice, misunderstanding, misrepresentation, etc.), by recognizing such agreements as exist (e.g., acceptance of the lordship of Christ), and by frankly facing divergences in mentality, spirituality, dogma, and polity. Interesting and sometimes incisive observations are made concerning differences between Roman Catholics and Protestants—e.g., with respect to their manner of praying (pp. 126-130). Occasionally weaknesses in Catholic practice are obliquely suggested—e.g., the exclusively scholastic method of thinking and the casuistical (unevangelical) approach to questions of ethics. But in the last analysis the only solution of the "Christian dilemma" is to be found in a return of Protestants to the "mother church," a divine institution which possesses the unadulterated "Truth" and has an exclusive claim upon the Holy Spirit.

Although the author defends the pope in his refusal to send observers to the Amsterdam assembly of the World Council of Churches (1948), he hopes that fruitful contacts may in time be established between Rome and Geneva. Of course, Catholic bishops will not be permitted to sit with Protestant churchmen as equal participants in discussion, but they may be permitted to observe what Protestants are up to or may even expound the "Truth" to them. (Roman Catholic observers appeared for the first time at the Faith and Order meeting in Lund during the summer of 1952, and their functions were those suggested by Professor van de Pol.)

This is a cleverly written book (compare the references to "the act of faith"). But it is also a forthright book. As such it deserves a thoughtful hearing. Lutherans will not agree with many of the

author's interpretations and observations, but they will find the book instructive. It is a wholesome exercise to see ourselves as others see us.

Attention may also be called to a much slighter work in the same vein by a French Jesuit, now published in an English translation: Charles Boyer, *One Shepherd: The Problem of Christian Reunion* (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1952), 142 pages. \$2.00.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

Christian Social Consciousness. By A. D. Mattson. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1953. 267 pages. \$3.50.

As stated in the preface, this book is intended to be what the subtitle suggests—an introduction to Christian Sociology. The chief value of the book, the author says, will be found in the principles enunciated. The book does not consist of a set of rules for conduct, nor does it suggest programs or techniques except by illustration. A book written from such a point of view would prove to be very temporary because society is never static, Dr. Mattson rightly maintains.

The author has divided his material into eight chapters. In Chapter I, The Meaning of Christian Sociology, he defines Christian Sociology as "a study of the Christian ideal for human association" (p. 10). "Christian ethics, like all ethics," he says in Chapter II, "is concerned with the question of the nature of the highest good and connects the idea of the highest good with the will of God (pp. 30 f.). The fundamental principle which may be used to determine the direction that social living ought to take "according to Christian Sociology," he says, "is the principle of the sacredness of personality" (p. 44). Plato, Bishop Martenson, Albert Schweitzer, and Jesus, he thinks, are all agreed in this, that a life-affirming ethic expresses the will of God in the ethical realm. "Evil is what annihilates, hampers or hinders life. Goodness

is the saving of or helping of life" (Schweitzer).

Chapter III deals with the biblical foundation of Christian Sociology. The eschatological implications of the Lord's Prayer, the author holds, are immaterial for his purpose. "The fact will still remain that Jesus was concerned about the will of God being 'done on earth'" (p. 93).

In Chapter IV the discussion centers around the importance of the kingdom of God for Christian Sociology. In this connection the author makes an act of reparation to Walter Rauschenbusch. Although his exegesis, he says, may be subject to revision, the fact that he made the kingdom central in his thinking is valid for all times (97). To lose sight of the kingdom in deference to the church is, in the author's eyes, one of the greatest calamities of Protestantism.

The remaining four chapters deal with problems of wealth, labor, rural life, and the state. These chapters contain a severe criticism of the Protestant churches which, the author holds, are still, by and large, in the grip of reactionary forces, desirous to maintain the *status quo*. He blames the rural pastors, for example, because they are content, by and large, to limit themselves to the specifically spiritual problems of their flock, not considering "it a part of their task to attempt any radical revision of the social and economic system of which they are a part" (p. 211). Concerning the state, ideally speaking, "democracy is the political expression of the Christian faith" (p. 241).

Personally, we can go a long way with Dr. Mattson in reprimanding the church for its inactive, complacent attitude toward the social problem. This is the more true with respect to the churches of continental Europe. However, we cannot follow the author in his theology. In our opinion, Dr. Mattson is too close to the theology of the Social Gospel. Even his vocabulary betrays this fact—for example, the frequent use of such words as

"religion" and "ideal," let alone the Greek concept of "the highest good." We cannot share the view that through social action "the kingdom of the world may become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ," as the closing sentence of the book seems to imply. Socialized Sweden, for example, is not closer to the kingdom than capitalistic America. It still remains to be proved which country has the larger percentage of repenting and believing Christians. True, some forms of social life are incompatible with the Gospel. For instance, the preferred position of the rich in capitalistic society is definitely un-Christian. But socialism is not a redeeming force; it has no spiritual power to release man from the bondage of his own ego. Consequently the unredeemed ego of man will find ways and means to assert itself in a socialized state. Because of the concentration of power in the hands of the state, socialism, as history proves, may easily become an instrument of oppression of human personality. No form of social life is an adequate expression of the kingdom of Christ. The whole "fashion" (I Corinthians 7:31) of this world is doomed to pass away, including monogamous marriage. At best some forms of life may be an approximation to the kingdom. As contrasted with the view of the author, we believe that the eschatological implications of the second petition in the Lord's Prayer are of utmost importance for a Christian Sociology.

This criticism notwithstanding, the book should prove to be a serious challenge to the ethical indolence of the church. The volume will make profitable reading for both pastors and students, as well as for the educated laity of our congregations.

OTTO W. HEICK

Arbets- och altar-teologi. By Gert Borgenstierna. Stockholm: S.K.D.B., 1951. 117 pages. Kr. 4:75.

The dean of Karlstad (Sweden) has given us an unusual treatment of ques-

tions vital to our day. The final chapter describes the effect of a current milieu on the generation living in it. Two chapters ask how the differing environments of the farmer and the factory-worker predispose each toward or away from the Christian church. A final chapter contrasts altar and pulpit in determining the type of religious interpretation that may flow from one or the other.

The value of the book lies in its focus on elements of today's religious world that need to be studied. Isolating aspects such as those treated here helps us to see our problems from a new angle, and may place those problems in new proportions to each other. Thus, there may be a tendency of the machine-worker to judge all of existence as the working of a machine, and the farmer may find the Christian message more congenial just because it grew out of an agricultural society. We are so addicted to clichés and habits of thought that our whole conception of our industrial age is unreal.

The discussion of the place of altar and pulpit stresses the check one may have on the other. The altar can become too impersonal and mystical, the pulpit too subjective and rational. The Roman Church tends to become too sacramental, but the Protestant Church is tempted to become too didactic.

The title of the book, *Worker Theology, Altar Theology*, indicates something of its contents, but one will not find here any comprehensive synthesis of such diverse ideas. Rather the author has given only a sketch of conflicting currents which make unsteady the course of the Christian church today.

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

Great Humanists. By Lynn Harold Hough. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952. 220 pages. \$3.50.

No other term in the vocabulary of the philosopher is more subject to confused interpretation than the term "humanism." Lynn Harold Hough, former dean of

Drew Theological Seminary, is a clerical representative of the type of Christian humanism which finds expression in the philosophy of Paul Elmer More and the poetry of T. S. Eliot. This book serves a valuable purpose as an exercise in definition. It indicates what it means to be a Christian humanist by carefully delineating the life and work of a number of men who have in common certain characteristics which contribute to the type of humanism admired by the author.

Aristotle, Cicero, Erasmus, Irving Babbitt, and Paul Elmer More are the men chosen as representative humanists. The essays dealing with these men give evidence of precise scholarship and a gift for interpretation. All of the men considered are literary figures, which indicates the strength and weakness of Christian humanism. Christian humanism can claim the educated man for the church, but it runs the danger of losing Christian humility.

Have there ever been any great Christian humanists among Lutherans? In some respects a man like Grundtvig belongs with this group. But what would have happened to the authors' definition of humanism if he had included Grundtvig?

MERLE W. BOYER

You and the Holy Spirit. By Stuart R. Oglesby. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1904. 108 pages, \$1.50.

This is a small book of twelve brief chapters dealing with what the author designates as "a neglected New Testament doctrine." His stated aim is to make this neglected doctrine "personal and practical for every day life." The chapters are in the form of devotional meditations on various aspects of the ministry of the Holy Spirit. They are not intended to be erudite discourses but homely, heart-to-heart chats. They give evidence of having been written by a man of maturity, of wide reading, of pastoral insights, and of a sincere concern for the church.

The burden of the author and his rea-

son for writing the book are succinctly stated in the opening paragraphs of the concluding chapter: "Perhaps no Scriptural doctrine has suffered so from neglect as the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and His work. This neglect has been of incalculable loss to the Christian Church and to Christians individually. Many church members who have faithfully attended the preaching services of their churches might honestly say, as did those 'certain disciples' of old at Ephesus: 'We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Spirit.'"

If the church is ever to recapture the power and the enthusiasm which characterized the lives of the early Christians, set forth so clearly in the New Testament, it must turn its attention more seriously to the revealed source of that power and enthusiasm. Perhaps it is true, as has been said, that Christians today are more like the disciples before Pentecost than the disciples after Pentecost. "Prior to Pentecost, they had been, for the most part, instructed disciples. After Pentecost, they were inspired disciples."

GEORGE AUS

Time and Eternity: An Essay in the Philosophy of Religion. By W. T. Stace. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952. 169 pages. \$3.00.

This short volume by the Stuart professor of Philosophy at Princeton University is the systematic companion work to *Religion and the Modern Mind* (also published in 1952). The latter book discloses the same point of view in an historical context provided principally by the Western philosophical and scientific traditions. The two books together give us in historical and systematic and polemic form sustained philosophic reflection and at a level which evinces as much originality, precision, and exactness in the service of a religious interest as has been expended of late in the interests of the philosophy of language and of science. It is to be hoped that those of religious per-

suasion and philosophical proclivity might sustain the argument at the level Mr. Stace does, this in order to reduce the offense the intellectual communities take in our manifest grossness and glaring ineptitudes.

Time and Eternity is a polemical piece and is aimed at the supernaturalistic theologians and philosophers. Mr. Stace questions the validity of the intellectualism of many religious believers which is warranted to provide literal knowledge about God and, besides, in propositional form. Furthermore he asks whether God can be said to be an object about whom any one can predicate. To question these beliefs is the author's mode of dealing with what he calls in his preface the greatest spiritual problem of the modern world, viz., the conflict between religion and the philosophy of naturalism implicit in science. No reader can deny that Mr. Stace's knowledge and abilities make his discussion relevant; for he is cognizant of contemporary logical and epistemological and ethical theory and knows the critique these have engendered as well as any philosopher writing today. But unlike so many contemporaries he does not believe the issue thereby to be resolved. Neither does he believe that the task for philosophy is to refurbish the supernaturalist's claims. He is therefore not content, as many theologians are, to turn from a nature metaphysics to a history metaphysics, nor is he happy with the prospect of reducing the literal propositions further by recourse to the device of distinguishing the essential truths from the accidental. With rare acumen and biting irony, he joins the chorus of naturalistic critics against the supernaturalists and even adds fuel to the fire. But with equal audacity does he attack the positivistic naturalists for their exclusiveness, and this by vindicating, in turn, the idealistic philosophers, the advocates of aesthetic experience, and the religious mystics by showing that their propositions are not, if non-literal, therefore emotive.

Lest however the suffering supernat-

uralists rejoice in Mr. Stace as the long-awaited defender of the faith, it is well to try to understand his point. Mr. Stace avers that religious propositions cannot be literal truths. He suggests that propositional truths have to be about nature and history and therefore that religious propositions must be understood to be "symbolic" and not literal. This means that any proposition which has the form "God is X," whatever it says—even that God is an existing being, for example—is meaningless if it is assumed to be a literal truth. What then is God? God, says Stace, is an experience, not a thing; God is not therefore an object of relation and subject to relations; God is not the object for an intelligence using a conceptual and mediating apparatus. If God is an experience, the relation to God is an immediate and intuitive relation and not conceptual. And the meaning of symbolic language can then be said to be evocative because the purpose of intersubjective communication is to indicate to another only that religious experience is present to one mind and can be experienced by another. Language is symbolic when both the symbol and the thing symbolized are within the locus of mental life. Language is literal when the symbol and the thing symbolized are not within this same locus. Symbolic language does not add truths, qualities, predicates, attributes. It is misunderstood if it is interpreted to have incremental noetic significance. This does not mean, either, that any experience is religious or that all experience is religious.

Mr. Stace uses many Eastern and Western mystics and also the idealistic philosophers to show that the same minds can and do have two kinds of experiences. All men predicate about things and logicize their predications to produce self-consistent bodies of truths about the world. The hope of supernaturalists and the philosophically inclined, Mr. Stace seems to say, is to extend predication and conceptualization to everything—beauty, the good, and God. Then all truth is

deemed to be a quality of propositions and the poet who says beauty is goodness or the saint who says that God is truth—either of these is thought to be ignorant and confused and subject to the “*aufgehoben*” exhilaration of philosophical genius. All of this Stace believes to be an error. But then there are the poets and the mystics who deny reality to any world that is sensed and is predicated about. Those who argue that only God is real and only God is good and kind—these, too, are in error. The author believes the solution to the problem to be in the direction of admitting that the order of time, predication, conceptualization, and propositional truths is self-contained and cannot be extended to eternity and the ineffable and the One who is the Truth, the Way, and the Life. The latter order is also self-contained when it is remembered that all of this order is within consciousness—and not in a spatial-temporal existence. To translate symbolic language into literal or vice versa is the mistake, and Mr. Stace believes that keeping the categories straight is a virtue which few, and particularly the conceptualizers on one side and the rapturous on the other, have yet practiced. “Time” and “Eternity” can intersect by being admitted into the same consciousness. This would mean that every man could have two linguistic systems, one evocative, the other literal; two ethical orders, one a neutral valueless order of truths, the other an order of goodness and badness in which the good is the true and the bad is error; two referents, a logical propositional system of implicatively related meanings and a cosmic point of reference for one’s hopes, loves and desires. Mr. Stace relates contemporary ethical and logical theory very skillfully to the issues above noted and by distinguishing anew he offers a unifying standpoint.

Though this volume is marked by great subtlety and a high quality of philosophic analysis, there seem to me to be many points demanding criticism. Mr. Stace seems to assume that the existential refer-

ence of conceptualizing and the naturalistic orientation of reasoning is a characteristic of logic or thought itself. I do not quite see what the grounds are for assuming that this existential reference of thought is in any way intrinsic to reasoning. It seems to me that logical theory and an awareness of the limits of knowing and of the objective uncertainty in respect to the relation between a thing and the thought of the thing permits us to say that the assertion of any kind of existent—God, world, or self, e.g.—is from the standpoint of logic an extra-logical and extra-rational matter. It seems to me that the propositional character of truth is the issue, and that within this locus several philosophic persuasions, and not naturalism alone, are stated.

The issue between supernaturalists and philosophers is, I believe, on the question of whether there can be religious propositional truths, and if so, how and why are they religious and true? Mr. Stace’s naturalism is gratuitous at this point.

Supposing, further, that Mr. Stace had considered the person of Jesus Christ and the relationship Christians have sustained with Him. As an historical personage Christ is an object about whom one may predicate. Truths about him would then be propositional and undoubtedly of historical, and not of direct religious, significance. The proposition saying Christ is God is not historical but is, if classical categories are relevant, metaphysical and/or theological. To say Christ is God is to follow him, and this introduces a behavioral and ethical component into the meaning. To say Christ is God means for some that he ought to be imitated, and here again the meaning of the expression is not in the locus of mere propositions. To reject the view that all the meanings of theological propositions are literal does not entail that one accept the view that God is my experience. It would seem that the Christian intellectual narrow-way is to keep an existential and historical reference about which one can

have propositional truths while at the same time making one's religiosity a function not of those public truths but rather of one's own faith and obedience. This is not quite what Mr. Stace says. This is why Christians say: the intersection of time and eternity is in Jesus Christ, and not in me, except in virtue of him. This seems to me to be the point that Mr. Stace neglects in his sharp dichotomizing. This, also, is why the Christ-mysticism of the New Testament assumes literal propositional truths of historical meaning as prolegomena to an intuitive relationship. Mr. Stace neglects the peculiarities of Christian mysticism and thus makes his philosophy of religion less adequate than it might have been.

PAUL L. HOLMER

Religious Faith, Language and Knowledge. By Ben F. Kimpel. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. 162 pages. \$2.75.

The "school" which today seems to rule the philosophy departments of many of our universities is commonly known as "Logical Positivism." A combination of semantics and an extreme empiricism, it has reduced philosophy to a parlor game of playing with words. While other philosophical schools have been in conflict with theology, Logical Positivism dispenses with theology in a rather new manner. Theology, it says, deals with notions that have no "real" meaning. God is a concept without a "referent." Theologians often accused of giving false information are now accused of saying nothing at all.

In our book the professor of philosophy at Drew University patiently and painstakingly attempts to show that this philosophical school, instead of solving the problems of "knowledge" as they confront the natural scientist and the theologian, merely ignores them by dogmatic assertions about language and reality.

In making his point he discusses not only contemporary philosophers but also those classical thinkers who have made

contributions to radical empiricism. He also examines those theologians who were greatly influenced by this philosophical trend, especially Schleiermacher and Rudolf Otto. The author concludes that radical empiricism is a dead-end street in the natural sciences as well as theology. In order to advance to knowledge in the sciences a radical empiricism must be discarded. He says, "An hypothesis is a belief about something whose nature one endeavors to understand, and its function in physical science is as clear as an instance of an act of faith as one can find."

Though this analysis of the "faithful" character of the scientific method is doubtlessly correct, Professor Kimpel's use of this insight to justify religious faith seems questionable. He says, "A religious interpretation of the world in terms of its expression of divine purpose involves the same type of faith as is involved in interpreting sensory data as evidence of physical reality." This is the same kind of reasoning on behalf of religious faith which got scholasticism into trouble. The Scholastics said that Christianity is true because it is reasonable. All the "Enlightenment" had to do was to show that it was not "reasonable" and its claim to truth fell forthwith.

Now Professor Kimpel suggests that religious faith is justified because it is "scientific." This is building our relationship to God on sandy soil. Furthermore, God is here reduced to the object of our religious quest, while the Christian church has always insisted that God actively intervenes in order to make this quest a success. While an astronomer indeed may discover a new star (e.g., Neptune) by interpreting the sensory data supplied by the behavior of Uranus, with the help of a hypothetical "Neptune," our faith-relationship to God operates within a completely different dimension. The Christian axiom is not merely that there is a divine reality which is authoritative for my life. It is far more specific: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." Faith in Christian terms is

therefore trust in a *person*, not merely acceptance of a hypothesis about the divine reality.

Though dealing with an important subject in philosophical theology, the book is weakened by the use of the esoteric jargon of the professional philosophers. For those who want a lucid examination of the philosophical school here discussed, C. E. M. Joad's *A Critique of Logical Positivism* will still be the best introduction.

GEORGE W. FORELL

The Enigma of the Hereafter. By Paul Siwek. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. xiv, 140 pages. \$3.00.

As the title indicates, the author wants to discuss what happens to man after he has breathed his last. Actually, however, the writer limited himself to a discussion of the theory of the reincarnation of the soul, a view which was professed by many peoples in antiquity and in our days constitutes a basic dogma in Buddhism and Hinduism and is popular as a "fundamental truth" in the eyes of the Theosophical Society and similar quasi-religious organizations.

The author, a professing Roman Catholic (the voice of the Fathers is the voice of the direct disciples of the apostles, whose voice in turn is the voice of the apostles, and the voice of the apostles is the voice of Christ in person (p. 17), first tries to show that the theory under discussion is limited, in the great religions of the world, to Buddhism and Hinduism. Since Buddha, however, does not know of a personal God, he has spoken without authority on the subject. As a matter of fact, he has simply borrowed reincarnation from Brahmanism. But how does Brahmanism justify its faith in reincarnation? As experts have shown, the theory is alien to the oldest phase of Hindu religion; its origin is shrouded in utter darkness. "Nobody can show by whom, when, how, by what right, nor in whose name the idea has been raised to a

fundamental dogma of the Hindu religion" (p. 18). Consequently, the author says, "reincarnation is a faith without a rational basis, hence a blind faith in the disparaging sense of that expression; a simple superstition" (p. 8).

In the second part the writer gives a critical account of the various psychological theories that have been advanced in support of reincarnation, but finds that all of them are wanting from the standpoint of the scientific method.

In the third section the theory is regarded as contrary to both Christian faith and ethics. It is incompatible with the biblical concept of grace. Its prevalence in the Western world, the author holds, is due to "the mentality of the times": the law of conservation of energy, the law of closed causality, and the law of evolution. But all these "laws" have of late been losing ground; they have entered a period of "crisis."

If the reader keeps in mind the Catholic limitations of the author, the book may be heartily recommended for a brief and concise introduction to the problem of reincarnation.

OTTO W. HEICK

The Idea of Development of the Soul in Medieval Jewish Philosophy. By Philip David Bookstaber. Philadelphia: Maurice Jacobs, 1950. 104 pages. \$2.00.

The title of this work would lead the reader to assume that the contents are historical and philosophical. But, in fact, the book is something else. As it reads, the pages are like excerpts from a catalogue of opinions, and the collected opinions are used by the author to present in very loose and hortatory fashion his own conception of self-development. The author, a truly distinguished rabbi in the Reform Temple of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, began this work years ago under the tutelage of David Neumark. At numerous places this indebtedness is dutifully acknowledged, but one has cause to wonder whether the twenty-five years of rabbinic since that time actually improved

the quality of the work when it was resumed.

Rabbi Bookstaber believes that thoughts are motivating, and he is concerned therefore to improve thoughts in order to improve conduct and history. The concept of the soul, he avers, is "a dynamic factor in positive living and thinking upon this earth." Without any serious disjoinders, being acknowledged, the author seems to say that men are so rational that given the right ideas they will have the right enthusiasms. He is so confident that he suggests that more reflection expended by some people—and of all creeds—on the concept of soul would allow for a more rapid realization of the millenium in history.

With this orientation he turns to seven medieval Jewish philosophers, including Gabirol, Halevi, and Maimonides. In a very cursory and textbook style he informs the reader as to the identity of each man, his general outlook, a few chosen statements about his views on the soul, and then he concludes each chapter with a section called "Reflective Analysis." This portion of each discussion gives the reader a chance to glean with the author the Bookstaber point of view from other men's writings.

The book seems to represent a kind of scholarship with an interest. Therefore each analysis of the Jewish notables lacks authenticity and objectivity. Neither the richness of Jewish faith and piety nor the precision and exactness of philosophical inquiry are disclosed. However, the book does make clear for Christian readers that the categories of Judaism were as difficult to relate to those of the Greek tradition as were the categories of Christianity. And the author of this volume evinces throughout his pages that he stands in the tradition that believes the alliance of Greek categories and faith was of great profit to both Jew and Christian and Greek. But there is no subtlety manifest here, and whatever the merits of the presupposition might be they are not evident in this book.

For the mystery of a God whose purposes are past finding out this religious leader would offer the mystery of motivating ideas. This is a novelty in the world that one might have believed erudition could have dissipated. For is it not the case that the idea of God and the idea of the soul is no more religious and no more motivating than the theory of humor is itself funny? The idea of the soul has a history, and as an idea its ways are not past finding out. This is apparently the advantage the Rabbi covets his readers to note. But he is disappointing, for he seeks to give ideas a religious significance which puts the mystery in the wrong place.

PAUL L. HOLMER

Sponsors at Baptism and Confirmation.

By Derrick S. Bailey. New York: Macmillan Company [1953]. 162 pages. \$2.25.

A subtitle explains that this brief study is "an historical introduction to Anglican practice," and accordingly one must not seek information here on practices on the continent during and after the Reformation. The paucity of evidence on early conceptions and practices of sponsorship forbids rigid conclusions. It is clear, however, that sponsors first appeared as character witnesses for candidates for adult baptism. Their function was pre-baptismal. By the sixth century infant baptism had completely changed the function of sponsors or God-parents, who now promised to instruct candidates *after* baptism. Such sponsors were originally the parents, but parents were replaced by others with the development of the extra-Christian notion that sin inhered in natural generation. The medieval conceptions of spiritual affinity were an inevitable accompaniment. Meanwhile the older emphasis on the church as sponsor was weakened and virtually disappeared. This study will provide much food for thought, for it dissipates many popular misconceptions concerning the history of an ecclesiastical institution.

CONTRIBUTORS

JOHANNES KNUDSEN is dean of the theological school at Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa.

JOHN HELMER OLSON is a pastor of the Augustana Lutheran Church, at Evanston, Ill.

E. E. RYDEN is editor of *The Lutheran Companion* and secretary of the Hymnal Committee of the Joint Lutheran Commission on Hymnal and Liturgy.

URAS SAARNIVAARA is professor of theology at Suomi Theological Seminary, Hancock, Mich.

BRYCE SHOEMAKER, a graduate of Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary, is pursuing doctoral studies at the University of Edinburgh and other European universities.

ROBERT SPIELER has been an instructor, and is presently professor-elect of theology, at Capital University Seminary, Columbus, Ohio.

LUTHER REED, EDWARD HORN, GEORGE SELTZER are of the United Lutheran Church, H. A. PREUS of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, CONRAD BERGENDOFF of the Augustana Lutheran Church, S. F. SALZMANN of the American Lutheran Church.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are E. E. FLACK, dean of Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; HAROLD L. CREAGER, professor of the Old Testament in the Southern Seminary, Columbia, S. C.; CHARLES M. COOPER, professor of the Old Testament in the Philadelphia Seminary; H. C. LEUPOLD, professor of the Old Testament in the Theological Seminary of Capital University, Columbus, Ohio; JACOB W. HEIKKINEN, professor of the New Testament in the Gettysburg Seminary; JOHN HALL, acting professor of the New Testament in the Southern Seminary; URAS SAARNIVAARA, professor of Theology in Suomi Theological Seminary, Hancock, Mich.; ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, professor of Church History in the Gettysburg Seminary; JAROSLAV J. PELIKAN, professor of Historical Theology in Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.; OTTO W. HEICK, professor of Systematic Theology in the Theological Seminary of Canada, Waterloo, Ontario; MERLE W. BOYER, professor of Philosophy in Carthage College, Carthage, Ill.; GEORGE AUS, professor of Systematic Theology in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; PAUL L. HOLMER, associate professor of Philosophy in the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; GEORGE W. FORELL, assistant professor of Philosophy in Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.